Catholic Ecumenism

This dissertation was conducted under the direction of the Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph C. Fenton, S.T.D., as major professor, and was approved by Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., S.T.D. and Very Rev. Edmond D. Benard, S.T.D., PhD. as readers.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
STUDIES IN SACRED THEOLOGY
(SECOND SERIES)
No. 76

Catholic Ecumenism

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM IN CONTEMPORARY PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

BY
REV. EDWARD FRANCIS HANAHOE, S.A., S.T.L.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1953

BR
+5
.C36
Ser.2.
No.76

IMPRIMI POTEST:
ANGELUS F. DELAHUNT, S.A.
Pater Generalis

NIHIL OBSTAT:
JOSEPH C. FENTON, S.T.D.
Censor Deputatus

IMPRIMATUR:
✠ PATRICK A. O'BOYLE, D.D.
Archiepiscopus Washingtoniesis

MAY 17, 1953.

Copyright 1953
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS, INC.

GRAYMOOR PRESS
PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

BX
1784
.H36
1953a

TO
THE MEMORY OF AN APOSTLE OF UNITY:
VERY REVEREND PAUL JAMES FRANCIS, S.A.
FOUNDER OF THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT
AND
ORIGINATOR OF THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE
THIS WORK IS AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATED

Table of Contents

FOREWORD 9

BIBLIOGRAPHY 15

PART ONE

THE EXISTENCE OF A CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

INTRODUCTION 43

CHAPTER

I. THE CONCEPT OF ECUMENISM 45
   1. Basic Ideas 45
   2. Papal Sources 52

II. THE DESIRE OF THE HOLY SEE 59

PART TWO

THE NATURE OF CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

INTRODUCTION 69

CHAPTER

I. THE GOAL OF REUNION 71
   1. The Unicity of the Church 71
   2. The Unity of the Church 74
   3. Communion with the See of Peter 84

CHAPTER PAGE

II. THE POINT OF DEPARTURE 97
   1. The Fact of Separation 97
   2. The Implications of Separation 102

III. THE WAY TO UNITY 113
   1. The Basic Principle 113
   2. The Manner of Reunion 117
      Section 1: Corporate Reunion in itself 117
         A. Heterdox Conceptions 117
         B. Notions and Kinds 122
      Section 2: Some Applications 124
         A. Graeco-Russian Bodies 125
         B. Anglicans and other Protestants 128

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 159

VITA 169

INDEX 171

STUDIES IN SACRED THEOLOGY 177

Foreword

At this time in many parts of the world, owing partly to various external events and changes of mental attitude, but under the inspiring grace of God, due chiefly to the common prayers of the faithful, a desire has awakened and is growing daily in the hearts of many who are separated from the Catholic Church, that a reunion be accomplished among all who believe in Christ the Lord. Assuredly to the children of the true Church this is a source of holy joy in the Lord as well as an inducement to lend their assistance to all who are sincerely seeking the truth by entreating light and strength for them from God in fervent prayer.[1]

These words of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office give expression to a curious phenomenon which we witness in contemporary society. The shrinking of the world by the speed of travel and the ease of communication has produced many species of social phenomena which were virtually unthought of in previous ages. The reverberations of purely local happenings pass far beyond the confines of the community into the world at large. The greatest single note to be perceived in all of this is the ethereal and unspecified desire for world unity. Yet, strangely enough, the very movements and institutions set up to achieve such a noble objective have rather served to reveal their divergencies in sharper focus. The basic issues which divide the human race are becoming gradually more clearly defined. The struggle which is likely to ensue from the conflicting conceptions of world order will probably be one of the gravest crises in all human history.

Desire For Religious Unity

The religious phase of modern history bears a close parallel to events of the political and economic order. There, too, we see a will to unity in the religious field. The multifarious non-Catholic sects of Christendom, assessing their chaotic condition, find it to be contrary to the will of Christ. The Second World Conference on Faith and Order which met at Edinburgh in 1937 expressed it as follows: "We humbly acknowledge that our divisions are contrary

to the will of Christ, and we pray God in His mercy to shorten the days of our separation and to guide us by His Spirit into fullness of unity."[2] They are beginning to realize, however dimly, that historical Christianity did not begin in the sixteenth century; that historical Christianity was one universal Church spread over the whole earth. The more enlightened among them are becoming aware that to this Church alone pertains the salvation of men and society, as they see it.

The realization that Christ wills His Church to be one and universal has passed from isolated aspirations of disparate groups to assume world-wide proportions.[3] Sectarianism is becoming more a source of embarrrassment than a badge of glory.[4] Congresses and councils have been formed to examine the question. No longer do the participants of these discussions come from homogeneous denominations or from diverse groups envisioning national federations. While these still exist, their orientation is international and comprehensive of sectarian differences.[5]

Ecumenical Movement

All these activities among non-Catholics in the direction of world religious unity are generically and collectively styled the "Ecumenical Movement."[6] Although there were many stirrings in the nineteenth century, the movement, as such, is a purely twentieth century product.

World Missionary Conferences

In 1910 at Edinburgh a conference was held which bore the title "World Missionary Conference." Non-Catholic missionaries from different parts of the world came together to discuss common problems. The personnel of the conference was chiefly composed of Evangelical theologians from Anglo-Saxon countries. The big question was unity in the mission field. The divisions of Christendom appeared a scandal to the pagans among whom they worked. Distribution of territories, equitable allocation of funds etc. would do much towards eliminating this scandal. A permanent organization was set up called, the "International Missionary Council." Later meetings of this Council were held at Jerusalem in 1928; Madras, India in 1938; and Whitby, Canada in 1947. This represents the initial phase of the Ecumenical Movement.

Life and Work Conferences

At a meeting of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches at Oud Wassenaer, Holland in 1919, Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Uppsala, Sweden (of the established Lutheran body in that country) offered a motion that a "Universal Christian Council of Life and Work" be formed. After a preliminary meeting at Geneva in 1920, a big meeting was held at Stockholm in 1925 and at Oxford in 1937. The personnel of this movement was chiefly liberal in theology. The basic line of discussion was mainly sociological in character rather than doctrinal. This is the second phase of the Ecumenical Movement.

Faith and Order Conferences

At the 1910 missionary conference, one of the participants was Charles H. Brent, at that time Episcopalian Bishop of the Philippine Islands (later of Western New York). He discussed with some of his confreres the possibility of a meeting where doctrinal issues would be faced. So, at the General Episcopal Convention in 1910, Dr. William T. Manning introduced a resolution that all bodies which accept Jesus Christ as God and Saviour should be invited to join in a "World Conference on Faith and Order." The first big meeting of this group was held at Lausanne, Switzerland in 1927; again, at Edinburgh in 1937. Every conceivable school of thought was at this meeting from pure liberals to fundamentalists. They were mainly concerned with doctrines and forms of polity. This is the third phase of the Ecumenical Movement.

World Council of Churches

There were two meetings going on at the same time in 1937: one at Edinburgh *viz.*, the World Conference on Faith and Order; the other at Oxford *viz.*, the Universal Christian Council on Life and Work. Delegates from each of these meetings met together at Westfield College, London with a view to fusing these two movements into one. Finally, at Utrecht, Holland in 1938, a provisional Constitution of a "World Council of Churches" was drawn up. Due to the War they were not able to meet until August, 1948 at Amsterdam, Holland. At this meeting we are told were "150 different church groups from 47 different countries, representing more

than 100,000,000 Christians of all colors and languages and creeds, dedicated to binding themselves to a working unity under the leadership of Christ."[7]

Catholic Interest and Caution

Such a movement as this cannot fail to draw the interest of Catholics. Possessed as they are of a divinely given unity, witnessing thereby to the mission of Christ, they look with sympathy to the desire of these souls which has most likely been providentially elicited. However, while even the precise *terminus* of the movement is not clear to the participants themselves, there is reason for fearing that principles operative in the movement may draw them farther away from the will of Christ than they are at present.

The two most noteworthy perils to be noted in the movement are the rejection of notions that involve perfect unity of faith and government in the sense intended by Christ when He established His Church.

The first peril is what may be styled "doctrinal indifference."[2] This conception sets aside the Divine will for perfect unity of faith, by holding the possibility for a wide divergence of belief, not only in "unimportant matters, but even in matters of vital belief."[8] Referring to this type of outlook, Pius XI declares that, "anyone who gives assent to such theories and undertakings utterly abandons divinely revealed religion."[9]

The second peril rejects the divinely given constitution of the Church of Christ. This view would spurn completely the primacy of the Holy See by asserting that no ecumenical unity can or should exist "whose consummation would involve the acceptance of the Roman pretension."[10] To grant aid to such conceptions, Pius XI declared, "would give authority to a false religion completely foreign to the one Church of Christ."[11]

In their zeal for the reunion of Christendom, some Catholics have, at times, transgressed the measure of prudence and even sometimes have contradicted basic Catholic principles. In so doing, they have occasioned much misunderstanding to the prejudice of true Christian unity.[12] Hence, the Holy Office observes:

Certain attempts, that are being designated by diverse names in different countries, have hitherto been made by various persons, either individually or in groups to effect a reconciliation of dissident Christians with the Catholic Church. Such initiatives, however de

not always rest upon correct principles, although inspired by the best of intentions, and even when sprung from sound principles, they do not avoid besetting particular dangers, as past experience has shown.[13]

Consultation of the official documents of the Holy See will provide sound principles and directives for such work. There is certainly no want of clarity in these documents, nor do they vary in any respect from what has been always taught and practised in the Church with regard to dissenters from her faith and communion. No better service to these dissidents could be given than to offer them a clear and unequivocal declaration of our position.

The unity of Christians cannot be otherwise obtained than by securing the return of the separated to the one true Church of Christ from which they once unhappily withdrew. To the one true Church, We say, that stands forth before all and that by the will of its Founder will remain forever the same as when He Himself established it for the salvation of all mankind.[14]

It shall be our purpose, in this dissertation, to set forth those principles which are necessary for the reunion of Christendom insofar as they are contained in these documents of the Holy See. These principles offer the movement the only secure and divinely sanctioned answer to their search for the unity which Christ intended when He established His one and only Church.

Personal Acknowledgements

The author desires to express his gratitude to the Very Rev. Raphael Grande, S.A., who, in his capacity of Father General, first assigned him to this task; to his successor in office, the Very Rev. Angelus Francis Delahunt, S.A., who graciously extended the assignment and furthered it by positive cooperation; to the Very Reverends Samuel Cummings, S.A., and Canisius Kiniry, S.A., who, as local Guardians, rendered the writer every possible assistance. His sincerest thanks are also offered to Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, S.T.D., who directed the composition of this work; to Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., S.T.D., and Very Rev. Edmond Darvil Benard, S.T.D., Ph.D., who graciously served as readers and helped the author with many useful suggestions.

NOTES

[1]Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXXII, 142: Eng. tr. "The Ecumenical Movement" in *The Catholic Mind*, xlviii, 1050 (June 1950), p. 379.

[2] Quotation by Paul Griswold Macy, *The Story of the World Council of Churches* (New York: World Council of Churches, 1947) p. 29.

[3] See William Adams Brown, *Towards a United Church* (New York: Scribners, 1946) p. 2.

[4]See Charles Clayton Morrison, *Can Protestantism Win America?* (New York: Harpers, 1948) p. 180-181.

[5] See Henry P. VanDusen, *World Christianity: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (New York: Abbingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947) pp. 208-236.

[6] See John A. Mackay, "The Ecumenical Goal" O. F. Noble *Towards World-Wide Christianity* (New York: Harpers, 1946) p. 42.

[7]James W. Kennedy, *Venture of Faith* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1948) p. 13. A serviceable outline of the movement can be found in William Adams Brown, *op. cit.* (the whole work.)

[8] William Adams Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[9] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 6; Eng. tr. *The promotion of true religious unity*, (Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1928) p. 2.

[10] John A. Mackay *op. cit.* p. 44.

[11]Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, *AAS*, XX, 11; Eng. tr. p. 9.

[12] For example, the following note is subjoined to a paper read at the World Council of Churches by an anonymous "Catholic commentator:" "To tie up with *Mortalium animos* is not advisable, nor to the *Codex Juris Canonici* can. 1325, par. 3 which forbids discourse with people of other faiths. The widespread *Una Sancta* movement in Germany shows that since Pius XII this canon is no longer in force." cf. K.E. Skydsgaard "The Roman Catholic Church and the Ecumenical Movement" in: *Man's disorder and God's design*, (New York: Harpers, 1948) I, 167. See also the treatment of interfaith discussions in Germany in: Adolph Keller, *Christian Europe Today*. (New York: Harpers, 1942) pp. 251-266.

[13] Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, AAS, XXXXII, 142; Eng. tr. "The Ecumenical Movement" *op. cit.*, p. 379.

[14]Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 14; Eng. tr. p. 14.

Bibliography

BOOKS

ADAM, KARL. *One and Holy*, New York: Sheed & Ward, 1951

AGIUS, G. *Tradition and the Church*, Boston: Stratford, 1928

AINSLEE, PETER *If not a United Church—What?* New York: Revell, 1920

———*The Scandal of Christianity*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1929

———*Toward Christian Unity*, Baltimore: Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, 1918

ALGERMISSEN, KONRAD *Christian Denominations*, St. Louis: Herder, 1945

ALLIES, THOMAS W. *A Life's Decision*, London: Burns, Oates, 1897

ANDERSON, WILLIAM K. (ed.) *Protestantism: a Symposium*, Nashville: Methodist Church, 1944

ANGLICAN COMMUNION *The Lambeth Conferences (1867-1930)*, London: S.P.C.K. 1946

———*The Lambeth Occasional Reports (1931-1938)*, London: S.P.C.K., 1948

———*The Lambeth Conference of 1948*, London: S.P.C.K., 1948

ANTONY, C.M. *The Angelical Cardinal Reginald Pole*, London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1909

ARSENIEV, NICHOLAS *We beheld His Glory*, New York: Morehouse, 1936

ATTWATER, DONALD *The Christian Churches of the East*, 2 vols., Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946, 1947

ATTWATER, DONALD (ed.) *The Eastern Branches of the Catholic Church*, New York: Longmans, 1938

BAINVEL, J.V. *De Ecclesia Christi*, Paris: Beauschesne, 1925

BANCROFT, JOHN R. *Communication in Religious Worship with Non-Catholics*, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1943

BARNES, A.S. *Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders*, London: Longmans, 1922

BARNES, ROSWELL P. *A Christian Imperative; our contribution to World Order*, New York: Friendship Press, 1941

BARROWS, J.H. (ed.) *The World's Parliament of Religions*, 2 vols., Chicago: Parliament Publishing Co., 1893

BASS, ARCHER B. *Protestantism in the United States*, New York: Crowell, 1929

BATTERN, J.M. *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944

BATTIFOL, PIERRE *Primitive Catholicism*, London: Longmans, 1911

———*Catholicism and Papacy; some Anglican and Russian difficulties*, London: Sands, 1926

———*Cathedra Petri* Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1938

BAYNE, C.G. *Anglo-Roman Relations 1558-1565*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1913

BAYNES, NORMAN H. *The Byzantine Empire*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1925

BELL, G.K.A. (ed.) *Documents of Christian Unity*, 3 series, New York: Oxford University Press, 1924, 1930, 1949

———*Christian unity; the Anglican Position*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948

BERDYAEV, NICOLAS *The Russian Idea*, New York: Macmillan, 1948

BERRY E.S. *The Church of Christ*, St. Louis: Herder, 1941

BIGG-WITHER, REGINALD *A Short history of the Church of Russia*, New York: Macmillan, 1928

BILHEIMER, ROBERT S. *What must the Church do?* New York: Harper, 1947

BIRT, HENRY N. *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, London: Bell, 1907

BLACKMORE, R.W. *The Doctrine of the Russian Church*, London: Aberdeen, Brown 1845

BLUNT, JOHN HENRY *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties*, London: Rivingtons, 1874

BOLSHAKOFF, SERGE *The Doctrine of the unity of the Church in the works of Khomyakov and Moehler*, London: S.P.C.K., 1946

BOLTON, ANSELM *A Catholic Memorial of Lord Halifax and Cardinal Mercier*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1935

BOSSUET, J.B. *A History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, 2 vols., Dublin: Coyne, 1829

BOURGEOIS, CHARLES *Reunion with the East*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1931

BOWDEN, J.E. *Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber*, Baltimore: Murphy, 1869

BOYER, CHARLES *One Shepherd*, New York: P.J. Kenedy, 1952

BRADFORD, A.H. (ed.) *Christ and the Church*, New York: Revell, 1895

BRANDRETH, HENRY R.T. *Unity and reunion; a bibliography*, London: Black, 1948

———*The Oecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement*, London S.P.C.K., 1947

BRENNER, SCOTT F. *The Way of Worship; a study in ecumenical recovery*, New York: Macmillan, 1944

BRENT, CHARLES H. *The Inspiration of Responsibility*, New York: Longmans, 1916

———*Understanding*, New York: Longmans, 1925
Brian-Chaninov, Nicholas *The Russian Church*, London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1931
Briggs, Charles A. *Church Unity* New York: Scribners, 1909
Broomfield, Gerald W. *Revelation and Reunion*, New York: Macmillian, 1942
Broutin, Paul *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, Paris: A.L.'Orante, 1944
Brouwer, F.W. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, Bruges: Desclee, 1881
Brown, William Adams *Toward a United Church*, New York: Scribners, 1946
———*The Church, Catholic and Protestant*, New York, Scribners, 1935
———*New Order in the Church*, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury 1943
———*A Teacher and his times*, New York: Scribners, 1940
Brown, William F. *Through Windows of Memory*, London: Sands, 1946
Brownson, O.A. *The Convert; or, Leaves from my experience*, New York: Sadlier, 1886
Brugere, L.F. *De Ecclesia Christi*, Paris: Roger et Chernoviz, 1878
Brunsmann, John *A handbook of Fundamental Theology* 4 vols., tr. A. Preuss, St. Louis: Herder, 1928
Buckner, George W. *Concerns of a World Church* ,St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1943
Bulgakov, Sergius *The Orthodox Church*, tr. C.S. Cram, London: Centenary Press, 1935
Burn-Murdock, W. *Church, Continuity and Unity*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1945
Butler, Cuthbert *Life and Times of Bishop Ullathorne*, 2 vols., New York: Benziger, 1926
Butler, Charles *Historical Memoirs of English, Irish and Scottish Catholics since the Reformation*, 4 vols., London: John Murray, 1822
Byron, Robert *The Byzantine Achievement*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1932
Callaey, Fredegandus *Praelectiones Historiae Ecclestasticae Antiquae*, Rome: Athenaeum Pontificum Urbanum De Propaganda Fide, 1944
Calvet, J. *Rome and Reunion*, tr. W.C. Turney, Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1928
Carson, W.R. *Reunion Essays*, London: Longmans, 1903
Cassidy, J.F. *Life of Father Faber*, London: Sands, 1946
Cavallera, Ferdinandus *Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae*, Paris: Beauschesne, 1936

Cavert, Samuel McCrea (ed.) *The Church through Half a Century*, New York: Scribners, 1936
———*Christian Unity: its principles and possibilities*, New York: Association Press, 1921
Cercia, Raphael *Demonstratio Catholica* 2 vols., Paris: Lethielleux 1878
Champagne, J.E. *Manual of Missionary Action*, tr. R.L. Laberge, Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1948
Chandler, Arthur *The English Church and Reunion*, New York: Gorham, 1916
Chapman, John *The First Eight General Councils and Papal Infallibility*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1928
Chesterton, G.K. *The Catholic Church and Conversion*, New York: Macmillan, 1929
Chitty, D.J. and W.A. Wigram *The Eastern Communions*, London, S.P.C.K., 1937
Chorley, E. Clowes *Men and movements in the American Episcopal Church*, New York: Scribners, 1948
Chown, S.D. *The Story of Church Union in Canada*, Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1930
Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement*, London:. Macmillan, 1892
Church Unity Octave Committee *Annual call of the Church unity Octave 1950*. Fittleworth. Sussex: R. L. Elderton. 1950
Clark, Elmer T. *The Small Sects in America*, Nashville: Cokesbury, 1937
Clayton, Joseph *Luther and his Work*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1937
———*The Protestant Reformation in Great Britain*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1934
Clerissac, Hubert *The Mystery of the Church*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1937
Cobbett, William *History of the Protestant Reformation*, New York: Benziger. n.d.
Coleridge, J.T. *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble*, Oxford: Parker, 1870
Confraternity of unity: a brief explanation of its aims and methods, Concord N.H.: Rumford Press, 1930
Congar, M.J. *Divided Christendom*, London: Bles, 1939
Constant, G. *The Reformation in England* 2 vols., tr. E.I. Watkin, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935, 1942
Corsevarem, Paul De *La liturgie Byzantine et l'union des eglises*, Avignon: Aubanel, 1926
Curran, F. *Major trends in American Church history*. New York: America Press, 1946
Curtis, G.B. (ed.) *Beyond the Road to Rome*, St. Louis: Herder, 1914

DANZAS, J.W. *The Russian Church* tr. Olga Bennigsen, London: Sheed and Ward, 1936
DAWSON, CHRISTOPHER *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1945
———*The Judgement of the Nations*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1942
DEMILLE, GEORGE E. *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church*, Philadelphia: Church Historical Society, 1941
DENZIGER, HENRICUS, C.BANNWART, J.B. UMBERG (eds.) *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, Ed. 21-23 Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1937
DIECKMANN, HERMANNUS *De Ecclesia*, 2 vols., Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1925
DOLLINGER, J.J.I. VON *The Church and the Churches*, tr. W.B. McCabe London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862
———*Lectures on the reunion of the Churches*, tr. H.N. Oxenham, London: Rivingtons 1872
DOUGHERTY, KENNETH *Ecclesia est theandrica ad instar Jesu Christi*, Rome: Pontificium Athanaeum Urbaniam de Propaganda Fide, 1948 (Unpublished S.T.D. thesis)
DOUGLASS, H. PAUL *Church comity: a study of cooperative Church extension in American cities*, Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1929
———*Church Unity Movement in the United States*, New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934
———*A decade of objective progress in Church unity: 1927-1936*, New York: Harper, 1937
———*Protestant cooperation in American cities*, New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1930
DOUGLASS H PAUL and E.D. BRUNNER *The Protestant Church as a social institution*, New York: Harners, 1935
DUCHESNE, L. *The Churches separated from Rome*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Trubner, 1907
DUN, ANGUS *Prospecting for a United Church*, New York: Harper, 1948
DVORNIK, FRANCIS *The Photian Schism: history and legend*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948
ELMSLIE, W.T. *The European Churches*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1944
EVERY, GEORGE *The Buzantine Patriarchate*, London: S.P.C.K., 1947
FAIRBAIRN, A.M. *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican*, New York: Scribner, 1889
FERM, VIRGILIUS (ed.) *What is Lutheranism?* New York: Macmillan, 1930
FIELD, RICHARD *Of the Church*, 3 vols., Cambridge: University Press, 1847

FITZPATRICK, V.J. *The Life, Times and Correspondence of Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle*, 2 vols., Dublin: Gill, 1880
FLEMING, DANIEL J. *Bringing our world together*, New York: Scribner, 1945
FOGARTY, J.H. *Priest and Parson, or let us be one*, New York: Christian, 1908
FORTESCUE, ADRIAN *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1929
———*The Uniate Eastern Churches*, London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1923
———*The Lesser Eastern Churches*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1913
FRAGHI, S. *De Membris Ecclesiae*, Rome: Angelicum, 1937
FRANCIS, H.E. *Have Anglicans full Catholic privileges?* London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1907
FRANCIS DE SALES, SAINT *The Catholic Controversy*, tr. H.B. Mackey, London: Burns, Oates, 1886
FRANZELIN, J.B. *Theses de Ecclesia*, Rome: Typographia Polyglotta, 1887
FRERE, W.H. *Recollections of Malines*, London: Bles, 1935
FUREY, F.T. *Life of Leo XIII*, New York: Catholic Educational Co., 1903
GAIRDNER, JAMES *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, 4 vols., London: Macmillan, 1908
GAIRDNER, W.H.T. *Echoes from Edinburgh 1910*, New York: Revell, 1910
GALLWEY, FATHER *Twelve lectures on Ritualism*, 2 vols., London: Burns, Oates, 1879
GASQUET, FRANCIS AIDAN *England's breach with Rome*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1920
———*The Eve of the Reformation*, London: Bell, 1919
———*Leaves from my Diary 1894-1896*, St. Louis: Herder, n.d.
GAVIN, FRANK *Some aspects of contemporary Greek Orthodox thought*, New York: Morehouse, 1923
GOODWINE, JOSEPH C. *The Reception of converts*, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1944
GORDILLO, M. *Compendium theologiae Orientalis*, Rome: Institutum Pontificium Orientalium Studiorum, 1939
GORE, CHARLES *The Anglo-Catholic movement today*, New York: Morehouse, 1925
GORTON, N. *The Anglican Church and Christian unity*, Toronto: Longmans, 1948
GOUDGE, H.L. *The Church of England and Reunion*, New York: Macmillan, 1938

GREGG, J.A.F. *Anglican orders and the prospect of reunion*, London: S.P.C.K., 1930
GRISAR, HARTMANN *Martin Luther; his life and work*, St. Louis: Herder, 1935
———*Luther* 6 vols., St. Louis: Herder, 1917
GROOT, J.V. DE *Summa Apologetica de Ecclesia Catholica*, Ratisbon: Manz, 1892
GRUDEN, JOHN C. *The Mystical Christ*, St. Louis: Herder, 1938
GUIBERT, JOSEPH DE *De Ecclesia Christi*, Rome: Gregorianum, 1928
GULOVITCH, STEPHEN C. *Windows Westward*, New York: Declan X. McMullen, 1947
GWYNN, DENIS *The Second Spring 1818-1852*, London: Burns, Oates, 1942
———*Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival*, Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1946
HAILE, MARTIN *The Life of Reginald Pole*, London: Isaac Pitman, 1911
HALIFAX, LORD (ed.) *The conversations at Malines 1921-1925; original documents*, London: Philip Alan, 1930
HALIFAX, LORD *Reunion and the Roman Primacy*, New York: Morehouse, 1925
——— ———*Notes on the conversations at Malines 1921-1925*, New York: Morehouse, 1928
———*Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, London: Longmans, 1912
———*Catholic Reunion*, London: Mowbray, 1926
HALL, FRANCIS J. *Christian reunion in ecumenical light*, New York: Macmillan, 1930
HALL, THOMAS CUMING *The Religious background of American culture*, Boston: Little, Brown, 1930
HARAPIN, THEOPHILUS *Primatus Pontificis Romani in concilio Chalcedonensis et Ecclesiae dissidentes*, Quarrachi: Collegium S. Bonaventurae, 1929
HARPER, THOMAS *Peace through the Truth: First series*, London: Longmans, 1866
HARRISON, A.H. *Evangelical revival and Christian reunion*, London, Epworth Press, 1942
HASELMAYER, L.A. *Lambeth and unity*, New York: Morehouse, 1948
———*The Church of South India*, New York: Morehouse, 1948
HAWKS, EDWARD *William McGarvey and the Open Pulpit*, Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1935
HEADLAM, ARTHUR C. *Christian unity*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1930
———*The Doctrine of the Church and Christian reunion*, New York: Longmans, 1920

HENRY, CARL F.H. *The Protestant Dilemma*, Grand Rapids, Mich.,: Eerdmans, 1949
HERBIGNY, MICHAEL D' *East and West in the unity of Christ*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1928
——— ———*Theologica de Ecclesia*, 2 vols., Paris: Beauschesne, 1947
HERKLOTS, H.G.G. and HENRY S. LEIPER *Pilgrimage to Amsterdam*, New York: Morehouse, 1947
HODGSON, LEONARD (ed.) *Convictions*, New York: Macmillan, 1927
HODGSON, LEONARD *Anglicanism and South India*, Cambridge: University Press 1943
HOOD, A.F. *English Catholicism and the See of Rome*, New York: Morehouse, n.d.
HOOKER, ELIZABETH R. *United Churches*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1928
HORTON, WALTER M. *Towards a reborn Church*, New York: Harper, 1949
HUGON, EDWARD *Hors de L'Eglise point de salut*, Paris: Tequi, 1927
HULL, ROBERT *Medieval theories of the Papacy*, London: Burns, Oates, 1934
HUNT, JOHN *Religious thought in England*, 3 vols., London: Strahan, 1870
HUNTER, A. MITCHELL *The Teachings of Calvin*, Glasgow: Maclehose Jackson, 1920
HUTCHISON, JOHN A. *We are not divided; a critical and historical study of the Federal Council of Churces of Christ in America*. New York: Round Table Press, 1941
INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL *Jerusalem Conference (1928)*, 8 vols., New York: International Missionary Council, 1928
———*Edinburgh 1910, World Missionary Conference*, 9 vols., New York: Revell, 1910
———*The World Mission of the Church*, New York: International Missionary Council, 1939
———*The Madras Series* 7 vols., New York: International Missionary Council, 1939
IREMONGER, F.A. *Men and movements in the Church*, New York: Longmans, 1928
——— ———*William Temple; Archbishop of Canterbury*, New York:
ISWOLSKY, HELEN *Soul of Russia*, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1943
JALLAND, TREVOR G. *The Church and the Papacy*, London: S.P.C.K., 1944
JANELLE, PIERRE *The Catholic Reformation*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1948
JANIN, RAYMOND *The Separated Eastern Churches*, St. Louis: Herder, 1934

JOHNSON, HUMPHREY J.T. *Anglicanism in Transition*, London: Longmans, 1938
JONES, SPENCER *Rome and reunion*, New York: Longmans, 1904
———*England and the Holy See*, London: Longmans, 1902
———*The counter-reformation in the Church of England*, London: Skeffington, n.d.
———*Catholic reunion*, Oxford: Confraternity of unity, 1930
JOURNET, CHARLES *L'union des Eglises*, Paris: Grasset, 1927
JUGIE, MARTIN *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium* 5 vols., Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1931
KEATING, JOSEPH *Corporate Reunion*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1938
KEBLE JOHN *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, Oxford: Parker, 1847
KELLEHER, S.J. *Discussions with Non-Catholics*, Washington. D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1943
KELLER, ADOLPH *Christian Europe today*, New York: Harpers. 1942
———*Karl Barth and Christian unity*, London: Macmillan, 1933
KELLY, HERBERT *The Church and religious unity*, London: Longmans, 1913
KENNEDY, JAMES W. *Venture of Faith*, New York: Morehouse, 1948
KENRICK, FRANCIS P. *A Letter on Christian union to the Rt. Rev. B.B. Smith*, Philadelphia: Fithian, 1836
———*The Primacy of the Apostolic See*, Baltimore: Murphy, 1875
KING, ARCHDALE A. *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*, 2 vols., Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1947, 1948
KINSMAN, FRANCIS J. *Salve Mater*, New York: Longmans, 1920
KNOX, E.A. *The Tractarian Movement*, New York: Putman, 1933
KNOX, R.A. *The Essentials of spiritual unity*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1916
KNOX, WILFRID L. *The Catholic movement in the Church of England*, London: Philip Alan, 1923
KOESTERS, LUDWIG: *The Church: its Divine Authority*, tr. E.C. Kaiser, St. Louis: Herder, 1938
KONCEVICIUS, JOSEPH B. *Russia's attitude towards union with Rome (9th-16th centuries)*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1927
LABIS, FRANCIS *Ecclesiae Catholicae demonstratio*, Paris: Lethielleux, 1864
LACEY, T.A. *A Roman Diary and other documents*, London: Longmans, 1910
———*Unity and Schism*, New York: Morehouse, 1918
———*One Body and the One Spirit*, New York: Doran, 1925

LAGRANGE, M.J. *The Meaning of Christianity*, London: Longmans, 1920
———*Luther on the Eve of his Revolt*, New York: Cathedral Library Association, 1918
LAMPING, SEVERIN and STEPHEN (eds.) *Through hundred gates*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1941
LATOURETTE, K.S. *Emergence of a World Christian Community*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949
LATTEY, CUTHBERT (ed.) *The Religion of the Scriptures*, St. Louis: Herder, 1921
———*The Papacy*, Cambridge: Heffer and Sons, 1924
———*The Church*, St. Louis: Herder, 1928
LEBER, CHARLES T. *The Church must win*, New York: Revell, 1944
LEBRETON, JULES and JACQUES ZEILLER *History of the Primitive Church*, 2 vols., tr. E.C. Messenger, New York: Macmillan, 1944
LEE, FREDERICK GEORGE *Reginald Pole; Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury*, New York: Putnams, 1888
LEIPER, HENRY SMITH (ed.) *Christianity Today*, New York: Morehouse, 1947
LEIPER, HENRY SMITH *World Chaos or World Christianity*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937
LEPICIER, ALEXIUS H.M. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, Rome: Typographia Romana 'Buona Stampa', 1935
LESLIE, SHANE *The Oxford movement; 1833-1933*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1933
LIDDON, HENRY PARRY *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey* 4 vols., London: Longmans, 1893
LINDSAY, COLIN *The Evidence for the Papacy*, London: Longmans, 1870
———*De Ecclesia et Cathedra, or the Empire - Church of Jesus Christ*, 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1877
LIVIUS, TITUS *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome*, London: Burns, Oates, 1888
LOCKHART, J.G. *Charles Lindley, Viscount Halifax*, 2 vols., London: Bles, 1935
LOWRIE, WALTER *Problems of Christian Unity*, New York: Longmans, 1924
MACFARLAND, CHARLES S. *Christian unity in practice and prophecy*, New York: Macmillan, 1933
———*The Progress of Church Federation*, New York: Revell, 1917
———*International Christian movements*, New York: Revell, 1924
———*Steps toward the World Council*, New York: Revell, 1938
MACKENZIE, KENNETH D. *The Confusion of Churches*, New York: Gorham, 1925

MACKENZIE, KENNETH, D. (ed.) *Union of Christendom*, 2 vols., London: Religious Book Club, 1938
MACY, PAUL G. *The Story of the World Council of Churches*, New York: American Committee, 1945
MAGUIRE, EDWARD *Is Schism lawful?* Dublin: Gill, 1915
MALDEN, R.H. *The Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England*, London: Church Assembly Press, 1937
MANN, HORACE K. *The Early Russian Church and the Papacy*, London: Catholic Truth Society, 1928
MANNING, HENRY EDWARD *England and Christendom*, London: Longmans, 1867
MANNING, W.T. *The Call to unity*, New York: Macmillan, 1920
MARCHANT, JAMES (ed.) *The Reunion of Christendom*, New York: Henry Holt, 1929
MARTIN, HUGH *Edinburgh 1937*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1937
———*Christian reunion*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1941
MATTHEW, ARNOLD H. (ed.) *Ecclesia: the Church of Christ*, New York: Benziger, 1908
MATHEWS, BASIL *John R. Mott, World Citizen*, New York: Harper, 1934
MATURIN, BASIL W. *The Price of unity*, London: Longmans, 1912
MAZZELLA, C. *De Religione et Ecclesia*, Roma: Typographia de Propaganda Fide, 1885
McCORKEL, ROY K. *Voices from the younger Churches*, New York: Friendship Press, 1939
McELHINNEY, JOHN J. *The Doctrine of the Church*, Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, and Haffelfinger, 1876
McINTIRE, CARL *Modern Tower of Babel*, Collingswood, N.J.: Christian Beacon Press, 1949
McKENNA, P.P. *Theology of Faith*, New York: Benziger, 1913
McNABB, VINCENT *From a Friar's cell*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1923
———*The New Testament Witness to St. Peter*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1927
———*Oxford conferences on Faith*, London: Herder, 1905
———*The Church and Reunion*, London: Burns, Oates, 1937
MEAD, FRANK S. *See these banners go! the story of the Protestant Churches in America*, Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1936
MERSCH, EMILE *La theologie du Corps Mystique*, 2 vols., Brussels: Desclee, 1944
———*The Whole Christ*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938
MESSENGER, E.C. *Rome and reunion*, London: Burns, Oates, 1934
MIDDLETON, E.S. *Unity and Rome*, New York: Macmillan, 1922

MIDDLETON, R.D. *Newman and Bloxam*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1947
MOEHLER, J.A. *Symbolism, or Doctrinal differences*, London: Gibbings, 1894
MORAN, WILLIAM *The Government of the Church in the First Century*, New York: Benziger, 1913
MORAN, JOHN W. *Catholic Faith and Modern theologies*, Worcester, Mass.: Heffernan Press, 1948
MORRISON, CHARLES C. *Can Protestantism win America?* New York: Harper, 1948
MORSE-BOYCOTT, DESMOND *The Secret Story of the Oxford Movement*, London: Skeffington, 1933
MORTIMER, C.C. and S.C. BARBER *The English Bishops and the Reformation*, London: Burns, Oates, 1935
MOTT, JOHN R. *Cooperation and World Mission*, New York: International Missionary Council, 1935
MOYER, J. *Aspects of Anglicanism*, London: Longmans, 1906
MURA, ERNEST *Le Corps Mystique du Christ*, 2 vols., Paris: Blot, 1936
MURPHY, J.N. *The Chair of Peter*, London: Burns, Oates, 1883
MURPHY, EDWARD L. *The Unity Movement in Protestantism*, New York: American Press, 1949
MURRAY, PATRICK *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, 3 vols., Dublin: Gill, 1862
NEWBIGN, J.E. *Reunion of the Church*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1948
NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY *The Via media of the Anglican Church*, 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1891
———*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, 8 vols., London: Rivingtons, 1875
———*Apologia pro vita sua*, London: Longmans, 1931
———*Letters and correspondence* 2 vols. ed. Anne Mozley, London: Longmans, 1903
———*Certain difficulties felt by Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1897
NEVE, J.L. *Lutherans in the movements for Church union*, Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication house, 1921
———*History of Christian Thought*, 2 vols., Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1946
———*Churches and sects of Christendon*, Blair, Neb.: Lutheran Publishing House, 1948
NIEBUHR, H. RICHARD *The Social sources of denominationalism*, New York: Henry Holt, 1929
NOBLE, O. FREDERICK (ed.) *Toward World-Wide Christianity*,. New York: Harper, 1946
OLLARD, S.L. *Reunion*, Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1919

———*A Short history of the Oxford Movement*, London: Mowbray, 1915
———*The Anglo-Catholic Revival*, London: Mowbray, 1925
Oxenham, H.N. (ed.) *An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century*, London: Rivingtons, 1879
Palmer, Edwin J. *South India: the meaning of the scheme for Church union*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1944
Palmer, William *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*, 2 vols., New York: Appleton, 1841
Palmieri, A. *Theologia dogmatica Orthodoxa*, 2 vols., Florence: Liberia Editrice Florentina, 1913
Palmieri, Dominico *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice*, Rome: Giachetti. 1902
Parker, Kenneth L. *The development of the United Church of Northern India*, Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1930
Parker, Thomas M. *Post Reformation developments*, London: S.P.C.K., 1936
Parry, E.G. *Divisions of the Church*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1938
Passaglia, Carolus *De Ecclesia Christi*, 2 vols., Ratisbon: Manz, 1853
Phelan, John *An Appeal for unity in the Faith*, Chicago: Donahue, 1911
Phillips, G.E. *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*, London: Sands, 1905
Plowden-Wardlaw, J.T. *Catholic reunion*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1935
Potocek, Cyril J. *Cyril and Methodius: Apostles of the Slavs*, New York: Kennedy, 1941
Poynter, J.W. *Rome, Christendom and a League of Churches*, London: R. & T. Washbourne, 1919
Preclin, E. *L'union des Eglises Gallicane et Anglicane*, Paris: Gamber, 1928
Preston, Thomas S. *Lectures on Christian unity*, New York: Sadlier, 1867
Puller, F.W. *Essays and letters on orders and jurisdiction*, New York: Longmans, 1925
Purcell, E.S. *Life of Cardinal Manning*, 2 vols., London: Macmillan, 1898
———*Life and letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle*, 2 vols., London: Macmillan, 1900
Rawlinson, A.E.J. and Charles Smith *The Genius of the Church of England*. London: S.P.C.K., 1947
Report of the proceedings of the Church Unity Octave held at Blackfriars, Oxford . . . 1942, Oxford: Blackwell, 1942

Reusch, Heinrich (ed.) *Report of the union conferences held . . . 1875, at Bonn*, tr. S. Buel, New York: Whittaker, 1876
Rhodes, M.J. *The visible unity of the Catholic Church* 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1870
Richardson, Cyril C. *The Sacrament of reunion*, New York: Scribners, 1940
Riley, Athelstan (ed.) *Birbeck and the Russian Church*, London: S.P.C.K. 1917
Rivington, Luke *Dependence, or the insecurity of the Anglican position*, London: Kegan Paul and Trench, 1889
———*Rome and England*, London: Burns, Oates, 1896
Robinson, W. *The Biblical doctrine of the Church*, St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1948
Rust, Paul R. *The First of the Puritans and the Book of Common Prayer*, Milwaukee: Bruce, 1949
Salaville, S. *Studia Orientalia*, Rome: Ephemerides Liturgicae, 1940
Sanday, W. *Primitive Church and reunion*, New York: Oxford University Press, n.d.
Sander, Nicholas *Rise and growth of the Anglican Schism*, London: Burns, Oates, 1877
Sanford, Elias S. *Origin and history of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America*, Hartford, Conn.: S.S. Scraton, 1916
Schaff, Philip (ed.) *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols., New York: Harper, 1919
Schaver, J.L. *The Polity of Churches*, 2 vols., Chicago: Church Polity Press, 1947
Schmidlin, J. *Catholic Mission Theory*, Techny, Ill.: Mission Press, 1932
Schultes, R.M. *De Ecclesia Catholica* (ed.) E. Prantner, Paris: Lethielleux, 1931
Scotford, J.R. *Church union: why not?* London: Pilgrim Press 1948
Scott, Sidney Herbert *Anglo-Catholicism and reunion*, London: Robert Scott, 1923
———*General councils and Anglican claims*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1927
———*The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1928
Segna, Francis *De Ecclesiae Christi constitutione et regimine*, Rome: Forzani, 1900
Senaud, Auguste *Christian unity: a bibliography*, Geneva: World Committee Y.M.C.A., 1937
Sexton, W.J. *Christians unite*, London: Faith Press, 1947

SHIELDS, C.W. *The United Church of the United States*, New York: Scribners, 1895
SHILLITO, EDWARD *Life and work: the Universal Christian Council on life and Work held at Stockholm 1925*, New York: Longmans, 1926
SILCOX, CLARIS E. *Church union in Canada; its causes and consequences*, New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1933
SIMPSON, W.J.S. *Some chief obstacles to Christian unity*, London: Faith Press, 1947
SLOSSER, GAIUS J. *Christian unity, its history and challenge*, New York: Dutton, 1929
SMITH, H. MAYNARD *Frank (Weston), Bishop of Zanzibar*, London: S.P.C.K., 1926
SMITH, K.L. CARRICK *The Church and the Churches*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1948
SNEAD-COX, J.G. *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, 2 vols., London: Burns, Oates, 1912
SODERBLOM, NATHAN *Christian fellowship; or the united life and work of Christendom*, New York: Revell, 1923
SOLOVYEV, VLADMIR *Russia and the Universal Church*, London: Bles, 1948
SOPER, EDMUND D. *Lausanne; the will to understand*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1928
———*The Philosophy of the Christian world mission*, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1943
SPERRY, WILLARD L. *Religion in America*, New York: Macmillan, 1946
———*Religion and our divided denominations*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945
STEWART, H.L. *A Century of Anglo-Catholicism*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1929
STONE, DARWELL *The Christian Church*, New York: Gorham, 1906
———*The Faith of an English Catholic*, London: Longmans, 1926
———*Who are members of the Church?* London: Longmans, 1921
STONE, J.M. *Studies from Court and Cloister*, London: Sands, 1905
———*Reformation and Renaissance (1377-1610)* London: Duckworth, 1910
SWEET, WILLIAM W. *The American Churches*, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1947
———*The Story of religion in America*, New York: Harper, 1939
TABARAUD, M.M. *Histoire critique des projects formes depuis trois cents ans pour la reunion des communions chretiennes*, Paris: Gauthier, 1824
TALBOT, NEVILLE S. *Thoughts on unity*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1920

TEMPLE, WILLIAM (ed.) *Is Christ divided?* New York: Penguin Books, 1943
TEMPLE, WILLIAM *Christian unity and Church union*, London: S.P.C.K., 1944
———*The Church looks forward*, New York: Macmillan, 1944
THOMPSON, ALEXANDER H. *The Division between East and West*, London: S.P.C.K.
THOMAS A JESU *De unione schismaticorum*/in: *Theologiae cursus completus*, 28 vols., Paris: Migne, 1840 (v.5)
———*De procuranda salute omnium gentium; Libri I-IV*, Rome: Collegium Internationale S. Teresa, 1940
THUREAU-DANGIN, PAUL *The English Catholic Revival in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1914
TIMASHEFF, N.S. *Religion in Soviet Russia*: 1917-1942, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1942
TOMPKINS, O. *The Wholeness of the Church*, Toronto: Macmillan, 1949
TOZER, HENRY F. *The Church and the Eastern Empire*, New York: Longmans, 1900
TREVERN, J.F.M. *An amicable discussion on the Church of England*, New York: Christian Press Association, 1856
THOMP, SEBASTIANUS *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, v.I., Rome: Gregorianum, 1946
TYSZKIEWICZ, S. *Doctrina de Ecclesia Theologorum Russorum Praeslavorum*, Rome: Gregorianum, 1937
ULLATHORNE, WILLIAM B. *The Anglican theory of union*, London: Burns, Lambert and Oates, 1865
———*A letter on the Association for the promotion of the unity of Christendom*, London: Richardson, 1864
UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE ON LIFE AND WORK, *The Oxford conference; official report*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937
———*Oxford conference books* 7 vols., Chicago: Willet Clark, 1938
———*The Stockholm conference; 1925; official report*, London: Oxford University press, 1926
VAN DE POL, W.H. *The Christian Dilemma*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1952
VAN DUSEN, HENRY F. *What is the Church doing?* New York: Friendship Press, 1943
———*World Christianity*, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1947
VAN NOORT, G. *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*, Hilversum, Holland: Brand, 1932
VASILIEV, ALEXANDER A. *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1928

VELLICO, ANTONIUS M. *De Ecclesia Christi*, Rome: Arnodt, 1940
VILLAIN, MAURICE *Pour l'unite Chretienne I*, Grenoble: Arthaud, 1943
VILLAIN, MAURICE and J. CLEMENCE *Pour l'unite Chretienne II*, Grenoble: Arthaud, 1945
VISSER'T HOOFT, W.A. *What is the World Council of Churches?* New York: American Committee, 1939
———*The wretchedness and greatness of the Church*, London: Christian Student Movement, 1944
VISSER'T HOOFT, W.A. and J.H. OLDHAM *The Church and its function in Society*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937
WALKER, LESLIE J. *The Problem of reunion*, London: Longmans, 1920
WALKER, WILLISTON and NEWMAN SMYTH (eds.) *Approaches toward Church unity*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919
WALSH, WALTER *The Secret history of the Oxford movement*, London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1899
WAND, J.W.C. *The Church; its nature, structure and function*, New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1948
WAND, J.W.C. (ed.) *The Anglican Communion; a survey*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1948
WARD, WILFRID *Life and times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1897
———*Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols., London: Longmans, 1913
———*William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, London: Macmillan, 1889
———*William George Ward and the Catholic revival*, London: Macmillan, 1893
WATTSON, PAUL JAMES FRANCIS AND SPENCER JONES *The Prince of the Apostles*, Peekskill, N.Y.: Lamp Publishing Co., 1907
WEDEL, THEODORE O. *The coming great Church*, New York: Macmillan, 1946
WHITTON, T. *The necessity for Catholic reunion*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1933
WILLIAMS N.P. AND C. HARRIS *Northern Catholicism*, New York: Macmillan, 1933
WILSON, H.A. *Episcopacy and unity*, New York: Longmans, 1912
WISEMAN, NICHOLAS *Essays on various subjects* 3 vols., London: Dolman, 1853
WOODLOCK, F. *Constantinople, Canterbury and Rome*, London: Longmans, 1923
WOODS, EDWARD S. *Moving towards unity*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1936
———*Lausanne 1927*, New York: Doran, 1927

WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER *Can the Churches unite?* New York: Century, 1927
———*Faith and Order; the second conference on Faith and Order*, New York: Macmillan, 1937
———*The Nature of the Church*, Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1945
———*Report of the deputation to Europe and the East*, New York: World Conference, 1920
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, THE *The World Council of Churches; its process of formation*, Geneva: World Conference, 1946
———*The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches; official report*, New York: Harper, 1949
———*Man's disorder and God's design*, 4 vols., New York: Harper, 1948
YELLE, G. *De Ecclesia et de locis theologicis*, Montreal: Grand Seminaire, 1945
ZABRISKIE, ALEXANDER C. *Bishop Brent; crusader for Christian unity*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1948
ZANDER, L.A. *The essence of the Ecumenical movement*, Geneva: World's Student Federation, 1937
ZAPELENA, TIMOTHEUS *De Ecclesia Christi*, 2 vols. Rome: Gregorianum, 1946
ZERNOV, NICHOLAS *Three Russian Prophets; Khomyakov, Dostievsky, and Solovyev*, London: Student Christian Movement, 1944
———*The Church of the Eastern Christians*, London: S.P.C.K., 1943

ARTICLES

ATTWATER, DONALD "East and West," *Blackfriars*, XXII, 258 (September 1941) 488-496
BATTIFOL, PIERRE "Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholics," *Blackfriars*, IV, 3 (June 1923) 865-892
BELL, G.K.A. "The Malines conversations," *Church Quarterly Review*, CVI, 211 (April-June 1928) 1-20
BOUSCAREN, T. LINCOLN "Cooperation with non-Catholics," *Theological Studies*, III, 4 (December 1942) 475-512
BOWER, WILLIAM CLAYTON "Protestantism's inner conflict," *Christendom*, IX, 3 (Summer 1944) 290-301
BOYER, CHARLES "The Amsterdam assembly and the ecumenical movement" *Unitas*, I, (English language edition) 1 (January- March 1949) 3-14
———"Ecumenism and conversions," *Unitas*, I, 2 (English language edition) (April-June 1949) 4-10
———"Le probleme de la reunion des chretiens," *Unitas*, II, 4 (Italian edition) (December 1947) 319-338

———"The Malines conversations," *Unitas*, I, 4 (English language edition) (October-December 1949) 43-49
BROCKLEHURST, MARK "The form of the Church," *Blackfriars*, XXVI 298 (January 1945) 7-13
BROOKS, LESLIE C. "The psychological conflict of the 'Roman' Anglican," *Clergy Review*, XII, 6 (June 1936) 382-387
BRUNELLO, ARSTIDE "La santa Sede e l'unione della Chiesa," *Unitas*, II, 4 (Italian edition) (December 1947) 339-353
CAMPBELL, T. BOWYER "Towards the Chair of Peter," *Unitas*, I, 3 (English language edition) (July-September 1949) 3-16
CANELLOPULOS, C. "Christian reunion from the point of view of the Eastern Orthodox Church," *Church Quarterly Review* XCVI, 192 (July-September 1923) 247-305
CASTIGLIONE, CARLO LOVERA DI "Correnti del pensiero Russa sulla Chiesa e sulla unita," *Unitas*, II, 3(Italian edition) (Settembre 1947) 237-257
CHAUMONT, VICTOR "L'ecclesiologie de Leon XIII," *Revue de l'universite de Ottawa*," XVIII (1948) 180-204
CHIMINELLI, PIERO "Motto ecumenico in senso al protestantismo," *Unitas*, II, 1 (Italian edition) (Marzo 1947) 79-98
CLAYTON, JOSEPH "The Church of England and protestant reunion," *Blackfriars*, VI, 66 (September 1925) 504-508
CLEARY, MICHAEL P. "The failure of the World Conference on Faith and Order," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, XXXI, 1 (5th series) (January 1928) 1-9
CLONMORE, LORD "Anglo-Catholics and the Holy See," *Clergy Review*, XVI, 6 (June 1939) 471-484
CONGAR, M.J. "Rome, Oxford and Edinburgh," *Blackfriars*, XVIII, 210 (September 1937) 646-659
CONNELL, FRANCIS J. "Pope Leo XIII's message to America," *American Ecclesiastical Review* CIX, 4 (October 1943) 249-256
DELAPORTE, LUCIEN "Apres 'mortalium animos'," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, VI (1929) 40-58
DEWAILLY, L.M. "Mission d l'eglise et apostolicite," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques*, XXXII, 1-2 (Janvier-Avril 1948) 2-37
DICKINSON, P. "Rome today and reunion with the East," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* III, 4 (October 1938) 215-231
"Dr. Pusey's project of union" *Dublin Review*, VI, 11 (n.s.) (January 1866)412-449
"Dr. Pusey on ecclesiatsical unity," *Dublin Review*, VIII, 15 (n.s.) (January 1867) 83-118
DOWNE, RICHARD "How to solve the problem of reunion," *Month*, CXL, 699 (September 1922) 193-205

FARRELL, AMBROSE "Reflections on reunion," *Blackfriars*, XVI, 180 (March 1935) 187-191
FENTON, JOSEPH C. "The catholicity of the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* CXVII, 4,5,6 (October, November, December 1947) 291-302, 375-386, 452-464
———"The Church and the Non-Catholic" *American Ecclesiastical Review* CXIII, 1, (July 1945) 44-58
———"An effective demonstration from the marks of the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review* CXI, 5 (November 1944) 380-390
———"Extra ecclesiam nulla salus," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CX, 4 (April 1944) 300-306
———"Factors in Church unity," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXIX, 5 (November 1948) 375-383
———"Membership in the Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXII, 4 (April 1945) 287-305
———"Theological proof for the necessity of the Catholic Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXVIII, 3,4,5 (March, April, May 1948) 214-228, 290-305, 361-375
GRAEF, H.C. "Reunion and the influence of Karl Barth," *Blackfriars*, XXII, 258 (September 1941) 477-484
GREGORY, T.S. "Et homo factus est: the prerequisites of Christian unity," *Dublin Review*, CCXXIV, 447 (First quarter 1950) 14-30
HALL, FRANCIS J. "The anglican movement for reunion," *Anglican Theological Review* VIII, 2 (October 1925) 97-113
———"The Church and christian reunion," *Anglican Theological Review*, IV, 1 (May 1921) 1-15
———"Requirements for reunion," *Anglican Theological Review*, IX, 2 (October 1926) 123-138
———"Reunion and the Roman See," *Anglican Theological Review*, X, 2 (October 1927) 103-115
HARAN, JOHN P. "One Church and reunion movements," *Theological Studies*, I, 3 (September 1940) 278-283
HEADLAM, A.C. "Lambeth Conference and reunion," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXI, 222 (January-April 1931) 205-226
HERMAN, EMIL "The Catholic and dissident churches of the East," *Unitas*, I, 3 (English language edition) (July-September 1949) 17-27
HODGSON, LEONARD "Anglicanism and the ecumenical movement," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXXI, 3 (July 1949) 125-132
HOLLAND, THOMAS "The Anglican Papalists," *Clergy Review*, XX, 1 (January 1941) 1-30
HUARTE, G. "Quomodo Ecclesia Christi, quae visibilis est, possit esse objectum fide?" *Gregorianum*, III (1922) 78-98

JUGIE, MARTIN "Will union be easy for the orientals?" *Unitas*, I, 1 (English language edition) (January-March 1949) 45-58
K.L. "L'assemblee d'Amsterdam et l'unite de l'eglise," *La Vie Intellectuelle*, XVI, 11 (November 1948) 5-45
KEATING, JOSEPH "Corporate reunion and continuity," *Month* CXLVII, 742 (April 1926) 333-344
———"The only basis of religious unity." *Month*, CLIV, 785 (November 1929) 408-419
KELDANY, HERBERT "Ut unum sint," *Blackfriars*, XXIII, 263 (February 1942) 68-74
LAGRANGE, M.J. "The reunion of the churches," *Blackfriars*, I, 7 (October 1920) 390-403
LEEMING, B. "De motu Oxoniensi et de anglo-catholicis," *Gregorianum*, XV, (1934) 59-81, 165-186
———"A note on the report of the joint doctrinal commission between the Anglicans and the Eastern Orthodox Church," *Gregorianum*, XIII, (1932) 528-580
LILAINE, CLEMENT "Concerning the eirenic method," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* III, 6, 7, 8 (April, July, October 1939) 337-356, 397-408, 443-460
MACEACHEN, BEDE "Origin of the Church unity octave," *Unitas*, I, 4, (Italian edition) (December 1946) 79-88
MCCLELLAN, WILLIAM H. "The Catholic attitude towards conference on christian unity." *Thought*, II, 1 (June 1927) 26-44
———"Christianity at Lausanne," *Thought*, I, 1 (June 1926) 153-169
———"Oxford movement in action and reaction," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXXVIII, 3 (March 1933) 225-240.
MCLEAN, G.R.D. "Archbishop Wake and reunion with the Gallican church," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXXXI, 262 (January-March 1941) 240-252
MCNABB, VINCENT "Canterbury and Rome," *Blackfriars*, I, 7 (October 1920) 381-389
———"Constantinople and the Lambeth conference," *Blackfriars*, III, 29 (August 1922) 251-265
———"Further steps towards reunion," *Blackfriars*, III, 32 (November 1922) 427-436
———"The Romeward movement in the Anglican Church," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, XXXVIII, 3 (March 1908) 275-286
MELAND, BERNARD EUGENE "The genius of protestantism," *Journal of Religion*, XXVII, 4 (October 1947) 273-292.
MONKS, JAMES L. "Relations between Anglicans and Orthodox: their theological development," *Theological Studies*, VII, 3 (September 1946) 410-452

MORRISON, CHARLES CLAYTON "Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," *Christendom*, III, 4 (Autumn 1938) 587-604
MURPHY, EDWARD L. "Church unity and protestant missions," *Theological Studies*, I, 3 (September 1940) 209-227
OUTRAM, EVENNETT "A historian looks at Malines," *Dublin Review*, CLXXXVI, 373 (April 1930) 243-265
PAUCK, WILHELM "The propspect for ecumenical theology today," *Journal of Religion*, XXV, 2 (April 1945) 79-87
POLLET, J.V.M. "L'anglicanisme liberal et le mouvement oecumenique," *Revue de l'Universite de Ottawa*, XVII (1947) 133-168
———"Le mouvement oecumenique Protestant," *Revue de l'Universite de Ottawa*, VIII, (1938) 128-153
POPE, HUGH "Professor Goudge on reunion," *Blackfriars*, XIII, 112 (December 1932) 785-788
"Rome unionism and indifferentism," *Dublin Review*, V, 9 (n.s.) (July 1865) 121-171
ROPE, H.E.C. "Is 'Anglo-catholicism' near the Church?" *Month*, CXLVI, 733 (July 1925) 43-57
———"The falacy of reunion," *Month*, CXLI, 703 (January 1923) 23-30
ROUQUETTE, ROBERT "Les mouvements oecumeniques," *Etudes*, 81, 258 (Juillet-Aout-Septembre 1948) 16-41
———"La premiere assemblee du conseil oecumenique Amsterdam 1948," *Etudes*, 82, 261 (Avril-Mai-Juin 1949) 1-29
RUSSELL, H.P. "Reunion fallacies," *American Ecclesiastical Review* LXVIII, 2 (February 1923) 125-135
———"The visible unity of the Church," *Month*, CXXXVIII, 3 (September 1921) 229-236
ST. JOHN, HENRY "The approach to reunion," *Blackfriars*, XVI, 179 (February 1935) 85-95
———"Catholics and the oecumenical movement," *Blackfriars*, XXIX, 334 (November 1948) 503-507
———"Collaboration and reunion," *Blackfriars*, XXII, 258 (September 1941) 471-477
———"Faith and Order," *Blackfriars*, XVIII, 212 (November 1937) 828-834
———"That they all may be one," *Blackfriars*, XV, 172 (July 1934) 456-465
SCHWEIGL, JOSEPH "De unitate Ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis restituenda, documenta S. Sedis ultimi saeculi (1848-1938) illustrata," *Periodica*, XXVIII, (1939) 209-233
SIERP, HEINRICH "The vain quest for unity outside Catholicism," *Month*, CXLVII, 739 (January 1926) 14-21
SMITH, SIDSEY F. "An experiment in corporate reunion," *Month*,

CVI, 496, 497, 498 (October, November, December 1905) 337-358, 498-513, 582-598
———"Mr. Ambrose Phillips de Lisle on the conversion of England," *Month*, XCV, 429 (March 1900) 277-289
———"The two recent addresses on reunion," *Month*, LXXXV 376 (October 1895) 153-172
SPARROW-SIMPSON, W.J. "Bossuet and Leibniz on reunion," *Church Quarterly Review*, CXVI, 331 (April-June 1933) 53-65
TOUMANOFF, CYRIL "Caesaropapism in Byzantium and Russia," *Theological Studies*, VII, 2 (June 1946) 213-243
TYSZKIEWICZ, STANISLAS "Adaptation doctrinale et unionisme oriental," *Unitas*, I,4 (Italian edition) (Decembre 1946) 15-30
"The union movement," *Dublin Review*, II (n.s.) 14 (April 1864) 279-312
VAN DUSEN, HENRY P. "The issues of Christian unity," *Christendom*, XI, 3 (Summer 1946) 327-340
VELARDE, RALPH "The conversion of England," *Blackfriars*, XXIX, 344 (November 1948) 517-522
VRIES, GIUSEPPE DE "Il problema dell'unione Chiesa orientali," *Unitas*, I, 2 (Italian edition) (Giugno 1946) 21-31
WALKER, J.L. "Anglia quaerens fidem," *Gregorianum*, III, (1922) 219-238, 337-354
WHITE, VICTOR "Leo XIII on reunion," *Blackfriars*, XV, 172 (July 1934) 450-455
———"The effects of schism," *Blackfriars*, XXIII, 263 (February 1942) 49-58
———"Membership in the Church," *Blackfriars*, XXII, 258 (September 1941) 455-470
———"Reunion in Catholicity," *Blackfriars*, XX, 220 (May 1939) 370-375
———"A reunion movement in Germany," *Blackfriars*, XVI, 181 (April 1935) 272-277
WOODLOCK, FRANCIS "Can the Anglo-Catholics unite Christendom?" *Month*, CXLII, 709 (July 1923) 1-11
YELLI, PAUL "Anglicanism and Catholicity," *Blackfriars*, XXIX, 344 (November 1948) 507-517

PAPAL DOCUMENTS

(in chronological order)

PIUS IX "In supreme Petri," 6 January, 1848, *Pius IX Pontificis Maximi Acta*, Romae: Typographica bonarum artium, 1885: I, 78-91
HOLY OFFICE "Apostolici sedi," 16 September 1864, *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, II, 657-662

English translation: Henry Edward Manning *England and Christendom*, London: Longmans, 1867: 227-233
———"Quod vos," 8 November, 1865, *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, II, 662-668
English translation: Manning *op. cit.* 236-247
PIUS IX "Arcano divinae providentiae," 8 September, 1868, *Acta et decreta sacrosanctae Oecumenici concilii Vaticani* Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892: col. 7-8
English translation: David Lewis, *The year of preparation for the Vatican Council*, London, Burns, Oates, 1869: 46-51
———"Jam vos omnes," 13 September, 1868, *Acta et decreta . . . Concilii Vaticani op. cit.*, col. 8-10
English translation: Lewis *op. cit.* 51-57
LEO XIII "Praeclara gratulations," 20 June, 1894, *Leonis papae XIII allocutiones, epistolae, constitutiones, aliaque acta praecipua*, Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1900: V, 272-285
English translation: "The reunion of Christendom" *Great encyclical letters of Leo XIII*: New York: Benziger, 1903: 303-319
———"Amantissimae voluntatis," 14 April, 1895, *Leonis papae XIII . . . acta praecipua op. cit.*, VI, 36-47
English translation: "To the English people" *Great encyclical letters op. cit.* 336-349
———"Satis cognitum," 29 June, 1896, *Leonis papae XIII . . . acta praecipua, op. cit.* VI, 158-189
English translation: "The unity of the Church," *Great Encyclical letters, op. cit.* 350-391
———"Apostolicae curae," 13 September 1896, *Leonis papae XIII . . . acta praecipua, op. cit.* VI, 198-210
English translation: "On Anglican orders," *Great encyclical letters op. cit.* 392-406
———"Religioni apud Anglos," 5 November 1896, *Leonis papae XIII . . . acta praecipua, op. cit.*, VI, 225-226
BENEDICT XV "Romanorum Pontificum," 25 February, 1916, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, IX, 2 (1 February, 1917) 61-62
———"Maximum illud," 30 March, 1919, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XI, 13 (1 December, 1919) 440-455
English translation: *Two encyclicals on the foreign missions*, New York: America Press, 1944, 31-52
HOLY OFFICE "Decretum," 4 July, 1919, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XI 9 (1 August, 1919) 309
PIUS XI "Rerum ecclesiae," 28 February, 1926, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XVIII, 3 (1 March, 1926) 65-83
English translation: *Two encyclicals on the foreign missions*, op. cit., 1-27

HOLY OFFICE "Dubium," 8 July, 1927, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XIX, 8 (1 August, 1927) 278

PIUS XI "Mortalium animos," 6 January, 1928, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XX, 1 (10 January, 1928) 5-16
English translation: *The promotion of true religious unity*, Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1928

PIUS XII "Summi pontificatus," 20 October, 1939, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXI, 13 (28 October, 1939) 413-453
English translation: *The function of the state in the modern world* Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1939

———"Mystici corporis," 29 June 1943, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXV, 7 (2C July, 1943) 193-248
English translation: *The Mystical Body of Christ*, New York, America Press, 1943

———"Mediator Dei," 20 November, 1947, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXXIX, 14 (2 December, 1947) 521-595
English translation: *On the Sacred Liturgy*, New York: America Press, 1948

HOLY OFFICE "Monitum," 5 June, 1948, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XL 6-7 (15 June-10 July, 1948) 257

———"Ecclesia Catholica," 20 December, 1949 *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII (31, January, 1950) 142-147
English translation: "The Ecumenical Movement," *Catholic Mind*, XLVIII, 1050 (June 1950) 379-384

PIUS XII "Humani Generis," 12 August, 1950, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLII, 11 (2 September, 1950) 562-578
English translation: *Humani Generis*, New York: Paulist Press, 1950

Introduction

To draw up a thesis on the Catholic conception of the reunion of Christendom is, in itself, an easy task. All the elements are clearly in evidence: the point of departure, the goal to be sought and the way towards its realization. Clarity and definiteness have ever characterized Catholic teachings. So great is their harmony among themselves and with Divine Revelation that each new problem which presents itself is met and resolved through the aid of principles at least implicitly contained in the treasury of revelation, through the cooperation of human reason enlightened by faith and the direction of the Divinely-sustained voice of the Vicar of Christ.

The principles, to which reference has been made, must draw their origin and efficacy as well as their motive and application from the supernatural order. Otherwise the certainty engendered will lack that finality which is required for supernatural faith and action. In the face of the problem of the reunion of Christendom, this becomes increasingly necessary. To restore men to the divine order presupposes a clear knowledge as to what it consists in; in what respect they have withdrawn from it; in what manner they are to return to it.

Criteria of Evaluation

There are two operative criteria, drawn from the supernatural order, whereby any scheme for the reunion of Christendom can be fashioned or evaluated: The scheme must draw its principles from Divine Revelation; the scheme must have the sanction of Divine Authority.

We have said, first of all, that the principles for the reunion of Christendom must have their origin in Divine Revelation.[3] The

deposit of public revelation came to an end with the death of the last Apostle.[4] St. Paul said: "But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel to you other than that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema!"[5] In its objective content, this revelation is fixed and immutable, though our understanding of it is susceptible of increase under the guidance of an infallible teaching authority.[6] There are two sources of this revelation: Scripture and tradition.[7] It is necessary to emphasize this fact, because, thereby, much misunderstanding will thereby be eliminated. As it was not the will of Christ that His followers should wander about in a sea of contradictions and confusion bereft of certainty and security, He left the care of His revelation to the living voice of His one Church.[8]

In the second place, the principles for the reunion of Christendom must also have the sanction of Divine Authority. The evidence for this can be inferred from the nature of the object sought. How otherwise could one know with certainty whether this or that scheme of reunion would in fact incorporate one into the unity of the Church of Christ or that he possessed the true faith and the divinely established means of salvation? Purely human ingenuity and the coalescence of many private opinions do not carry with them any assurance of Divine approval. There is only one agency empowered to speak for God in this world, and its decisions are ratified in Heaven—that is, the See of Peter: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."[9]

These, then, are the two operative criteria in evaluating any scheme which proposes to reunite Christendom: Divine Revelation and approval of the Holy See.

CHAPTER ONE

The Concept of Ecumenism

I. BASIC IDEAS

The term "Ecumenism" (or, "Oecumenism") is very often found in contemporary religious literature in connection with the problem of the reunion of Christendom. Broadly and generically speaking, this term and its derivatives are employed to designate the complexus of doctrines and methods looking to religious unity on a world-wide scale.

The Question of Terms

But before discussing the use of the term in the context of present-day movements, it would be useful to inquire into its philological origins. The word is derived from the Greek, "οἰκουμένη" and has for its meaning "the inhabited world." Originally, the conception was coterminous with the Greek Empire; later, the Romans employed it for their own empire. Latin authors used the term "orbis terrarum" which is its equivalent. St. Luke employs it in its civil sense when speaking of the decree of Caesar Augustus "that the *whole world* should be enrolled."[1] St. Matthew used the term in quoting the words of Our Lord, referring to the world mission of the Church: "... the gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the *whole world*, for a witness to all nations ..."[2]

The term was employed in some of the earliest Christian writings. For example, in the "Martyrdom of Polycarp" (156-7) we read that before he was put to death he prayed for everyone who had any association with him and "for the Catholic Church throughout the *whole world*."[3] Later, it was made the technical term for a general council of the Church. St. Athanasius (295-373) employed the term in this fashion when he said, "The word of the Lord uttered by the *Ecumenical* synod of Nicea abides forever."[4]

Non-Catholic Use

Non-Catholic authors of the present day, writing on subjects pertaining to religious unity are fascinated by the term, so great is the contrast between their desires and their actual condition. It will be of interest, before proceeding, to examine into a few instances of the use of the term among these authors. Some use the term to express a mutual recognition between members of diverse sectarian "traditions" as fellow members of one Church: "In essence, 'oecumenism' is to take full seriously a fellow-Christian of a separated Church; to accept him 'in Christ,' and so *in Christ's Body*; to accept him, not in spite of, but *because of* his membership in another tradition."[5]

Some express themselves in terms of a *terminus ad quem*, that is, to some unspecified goal which, from their viewpoint, does not presently exist:

"In plain English, the Ecumenical Movement is a *movement towards one universal Christian Church, 'throughout the whole inhabited world.'*"[6]

Others, again, take their view from a *terminus a quo*, that is, a gradual manifestation of an existing, though invisible, unity. For example: "The ecumenical reformation asserts the unity of the Church in the midst of the disunity of the churches."[7] "Ecumenical is the key word in the drama of an unfolding consciouness of world community constituted by common unities embracing all the many different kinds of Christians."[8]

The above citations will suffice to indicate the general tenor of non-Catholic treatment of the notion of Ecumenism.

Catholic Use

Among Catholic authors, the term "Ecumenism" is not of frequent use, but it is beginning to take hold in circles interested in the reunion question. Of course, the connotation of the term is entirely different from that of the non-Catholic. For example, Father Charles Boyer, S.J. employs the term to designate a corporate return of a separated religious body to the Catholic Church in contra-distinction to individual conversion:

In the intention of its authors and promoters, ecumenism has always been a movement destined to unite (or at least to tend to unite) the

different Christian "churches" in one sole Church of Christ. A *Catholic ecumenism* will then look toward a return of the separated Oriental Churches and the Protestant communities to the Roman Church. It is not directed to individuals, but to those bodies of which the individuals are members."

We shall have occasion later on, to discuss this conception especially with reference to the "corporate" feature. We have simply placed the citation here to illustrate the use of the term itself.

The Question of Ideas

Having set forth the various ways in which the term "Ecumenism" is employed, we now proceed to analyze those notions which provide the elements of a doctrinal definition.

Theologically and historically the term "Ecumenism" is intrinsically cognate with the term "catholicism." For example, St. Cyril of Jerusalem (313-386) declared: "The Church is called Catholic, for the reason that it is spread throughout the whole world διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάσης εἶναι τῆς οἰκουμένης . . . and because it teaches universally and without defect all the dogmas which must come to the knowledge of men . . ."[1]

In other words, "ecumenicity" is that property of the Church founded by Christ whereby it spreads itself throughout the whole world; it is the historical and progressive realization of the mission of Christ which is to reconcile all things in himself. We are wont to style this property of the Church as "Catholicity" both *de jure* and *de facto*. This is derived from the solemn commission made to the Church by Christ; as Pope Benedict XV expressed it:

The great and sublime mission which Our Lord Jesus Christ, just before returning to the Father, entrusted to His disciples in these words, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15), was certainly not to terminate with the death of the Apostles, but to endure through the medium of their successors until the end of time, that is, as long as there should be men to save by the teaching of the truth. And in fact since that day when they "went forth and preached everywhere," so that "their sound hath gone forth into all the earth and their words to the ends of the world," the Holy Church of God, remembering the divine command, has never ceased through the centuries to send out continually heralds and ministers of the Divine Word to announce the tidings of eternal salvation brought to the human race by Christ.[2]

The reason for this ecumenical mission lies in the final cause of the Church; Pius XI said: "For the Church has no other reason for existence, than, by enlarging the kingdom of Christ throughout the world, to make all men participate in His salutary redemption."[3]

It should be further noted that this ecumenicity is not simply a *material* diffusion throughout the world. It is *formal* ecumenicity as well. That is to say it is conjoined to unity and is numerically the same body that is spread throughout the world. As Pope Leo XIII expressed it: "The true union among Christians is that which Jesus Christ, the Author of the Church, instituted and willed, and which consists in a unity of faith and a unity of government."[4]

The activities designated by the term "Ecumenism" in their objective and historical connotation are distinctive and proper functions of the one True Church alone. For to that Church alone was committed the task of teaching and sanctifying the whole world; this is embraced within its proper name, "Catholic." St. Augustine (354-430) wrote:

The Christian religion is binding upon us, as also the communion of that Church which is Catholic, and is called Catholic not only by its own members, but also by all its enemies. . . . For they [the heretics and schismatics] cannot be understood unless they describe it by that name whereby it is called by the whole world.[5]

St. Cyprian (200-258) describes her Ecumenical diffusion, conjoined to unity:

. . . the Church, illumined by the light of her Lord, sends forth her rays throughout the world: still, it is one light which is everywhere diffused, nor is there any division in the unity of her body. She stretches her branches throughout the whole earth in the abundance of her plentiful growth. Further and further she extends her streams, yet one is her head, and one is her source . . .[6]

Foundations of Ecumenism

The *remota* foundation of Catholic Ecumenism is the theandric and priestly office of the Church.[7] The Church is the continuation of the Incarnation and Redemptive work of Jesus Christ. The very *esse* of the Church is to be found in the name she has been given, the "Mystical Body of Christ."[8] Pope Pius XII notes:

. . . this naming of the Body of Christ is not to be explained solely by the fact that Christ must be called the Head of His Mystical

Body, but also by the fact that He so sustains the Church, and so in a certain sense lives in the Church that it is, as it were, another Christ. . . . by His divine power (Christ) permeates His whole Body and nourishes and sustains each of the members according to the place they occupy in the Body, very much as the vine nourishes and makes fruitful the branches which are joined to it. . . ."

As with her *esse*, so also with her *operatio*, the Church continues the work done by Christ with His perpetual support and influx of Divine power. Pius XII said:

The Word of God willed to make use of our nature, when in excruciating agony He would redeem mankind; in much the same way throughout the centuries He makes use of the Church that the work might endure. . . . Our Saviour shares His most personal prerogatives with the Church in such a way that she may portray in her whole life, both external and internal, a most faithful image of Christ. For in virtue of the juridical mission by which Our Divine Redeemer sent His Apostles into the world, as He had been sent by the Father, it is He who through the Church baptizes, teaches, rules, looses, binds, offers, sacrifices. . . ."

Catholic Ecumenism, then, is the historical and dynamic and progressive realization of the mission of Christ—to reconcile all things in Himself. It advances His Kingdom to the very limits of the world, with Himself as the primary agent, since He is the Head of the Body. This work of Christ is perpetually committed to the Church and this permanency is effected by the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit, who is called the "soul" of the Mystical Body: "To this Spirit of Christ, too, as to an invisible principle, is to be ascribed the fact that all the parts of the Body are joined one with the other and with their exalted Head; for He is entire in the Head, entire in the Body and entire in each of the members . . ."

The *proximate* foundation of Catholic Ecumenism is that in virtue of which the mission of Christ is visibly and historically realized, namely, the immutable will of Christ that the incumbent of the See of Peter should enjoy a magisterial and juridical primacy over the whole Church. In the document of the Council of Florence, (1438-1445 A.D.) signed by the Greek dissidents on the occasion of their return to unity at that time, we read:

Again we define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world [*εἰς ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην*]

and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter Prince of the Apostles and true Vicar of Christ, that he is the head of the whole Church and the father and teacher of all Christians; and to the same was given in the blessed Peter the power of feeding, ruling and governing the universal Church by Our Lord Jesus Christ, as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils and the sacred canons."

Later, we shall have occasion to return to the ecumenical primacy of the Pope in the actual exercise of Catholic Ecumenism. Suffice it to say here that the Holy See is the divinely-given visible source of cohesion in the Mystical Body. Leo XIII said:

. . . it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests upon its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church, and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity."

Most General Sense

Gathering together the elements we have noted, the time has come to attempt a definition of Catholic Ecumenism. We may express it as follows: Catholic Ecumenism, *in its most general sense*, is that divinely commanded and divinely sustained work of the reconciliation of all men with God, through their incorporation into the unity of Mystical Body of Christ, proceeding from the effective direction of the center, which is the See of Peter, to the limits of the world. This centrality and universality is suggested in the words of St. John Chrysostom: (344-407) "The Father gives the revelation of the Son to Peter; and the Son commissions him to spread the knowledge of Himself and the Father throughout the whole world, and He gives all the power in heaven to a mortal man as He gives the keys to him who extends the Church throughout the whole world."
Used in this most general sense, Catholic Ecumenism coincides with the field of missiology. For further information and development of the content of this notion, reference may be had to manuals which treat of the subject."

Special Sense

The concept of Catholic Ecumenism also admits of a special sense;

that sense, namely, in which it is employed in this dissertation. It differs from the general sense only as regards its immediate object. But before formulating this immediate object certain previous considerations are necessary.

There has never been and there is not now more than one Church of Christ. Its mission, its constitution and its unity are divinely-given and its duration is from the time of the Apostles until the end of the world. As St. Cyprian (200-258) said: "There is one God and one Christ and one Church and one chair founded by the voice of the Lord on Peter. Another altar cannot be established and a new priesthood cannot be instituted besides that one altar and one priesthood. Whoever gathers elsewhere, scatters."[28]

Down the ages many men have abandoned the divinely-given unity of the Church of Christ, by separating themselves from the bond of faith or charity with the divinely established center of the Church, the See of Peter.[29] These events were virtually revolts from the Divine Authority of Jesus Christ Himself. As the Lord had said to Samuel of old: "For they have not rejected thee, but me, that I should not reign over them."[30] Their acts of revolt are not correctly designated as divisions *of* the Church, but rather as separations *from* the Church. St. John notes: "They have gone forth from us, but, they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would surely have continued with us; but they were to be made manifest, that not one of them is of us."[31]

To reconcile these men or their descendants to the unity of the Church is a sizeable project in the immense missionary enterprise of the Church. For example, St. Ignatius of Antioch (D. 107) declared:

> As many as are of God and Jesus Christ, these are with the bishop; and as many, moved by penitence, *as shall return to the unity of the Church*, these also will be of God, so as to live according to Jesus Christ. . . . Be not mistaken, my brethren: if anyone should ally himself with a schismatic, he does not attain the inheritance of the divine kingdom; if anyone walks in a foreign teaching, he does not have a share in the passion [of Christ.][32]

We are now in a position to give a definition of Catholic Ecumenism in its specific sense. We may express it as follows: Catholic Ecumenism, *in its special sense*, is that divinely-commanded and divinely-sustained work of reconciliation, which has for its object the conversion and return of baptized dissidents to the unity of the Mystical

Body of Christ, which involves their acceptance of the faith and communion of the See of Peter and the Catholic Church throughout the world. This definition is confirmed by the following words of Pope Pius XI:

> The unity of Christians cannot be otherwise obtained than by securing the return of the separated to the one true Church from which they once unhappily withdrew. To the one true Church of Christ, We say, that stands forth before all and that by the will of its Founder will remain forever the same as when He Himself established it for the salvation of all mankind.[33]

The exposition of this proposition is the proper burden of this dissertation.

2. PAPAL SOURCES

The teaching of Catholic Ecumenism has been consistent down the ages; its basic principles have ever been the same. Yet, in recent times, this has become more explicit due to the external pressure of contemporary history. The general movement towards unity outside the Church has elicited certain documents from the Holy See, both by way of instruction of Catholics and by way of invitations addressed to the non-Catholic world. These documents embody the ecumenical doctrine of the Church as immediately pertinent to the Ecumenical Movement. For the purposes of this dissertation, we choose for our primary consideration those documents which bear upon the general question of the reunion of Christendom. The documents which treat of special questions, such as the Greek Schismatics,[34] Anglican Orders and so forth would deserve a special treatment beyond the immediate scope of our present inquiry. Some will be used by way of illustration, but as subordinated to the general doctrine in which they are incorporated.

The first document studied here was occasioned by the institution of the *Association for the promotion of the Unity of Christendom* (A.P.U.C.). This organization was instituted as the result of a meeting which took place in the home of an Anglican clergyman, Frederick George Lee on September 8, 1857. Both Catholics and non-Catholics were present. Under the motion of a Catholic layman,

Ambrose Phillips de Lisle, the following resolution was adopted: "That a Society, to be called the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, now be formed, 'for united prayer that visible unity may be restored to Christendom' . . ."[30]
In its solicitation for membership the A.P.U.C. announced its purpose as follows:

An Association has been formed under the above title, to unite in a bond of intercessory prayer members both of the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican communions . . . To all, then who, while they lament the divisions among Christians, look forward for their healing mainly to a corporate reunion of those three great bodies which claim for themselves the inheritance of the priesthood and the name of Catholic, an appeal is made . . .[31]

The Association also published the "Union Newspaper" in which articles of very questionable calibre were admitted. The Catholic hierarchy became alarmed at the principles inherent in the Association which were gradually becoming manifest. Finally, in September 16, 1864 the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office directed a letter to Bishops of England, the *Apostolicae sedi*,[32] condemning the Association, setting forth its reasons for doing so. It was addressed to Catholics, warning them against the errors involved in the Association and forbidding their membership therein.

The following summer, 198 Anglican clergymen directed a letter to Cardinal Patrizi, prefect of the Holy Office. The drafting of the letter, it is asserted, was chiefly the work of the Catholic, de Lisle.[33] The letter sought to allay the fears that were expressed in the communication to the English Bishops. This letter evoked another statement of the Cardinal on November 8, 1865: *Quod vos*.[34] In this reply, the basic principles of Catholic Ecumenism were enunciated with great clarity and kindness.

A few years later, in the course of preparation for the Vatican Council, Pope Pius IX wrote two Apostolic letters: the one, *Arcano Divino*, to "All bishops of the oriental rite not in communion with the Holy See,"[35] the other, *Iam vos omnes*, to "All Protestants and other non-Catholics."[36] In these letters, the Pope urged the addressees to return to the unity of the Catholic Church on the occasion of this Ecumenical Council. These invitations were generally spurned. They embody many Catholic Ecumenical principles.

The next incident of note is the letter of Pope Leo XIII to Cardinal Satolli, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, *Coetus in*

foederatis Americae, of September 18, 1895.[37] In Chicago, in 1893, the Columbian Exposition, in addition to other matters, set up a "World Parliament of Religions."[38] Prominent members of the American Catholic hierarchy took part. The Pope, having learned about it some time later, expressed his disapproval in the letter cited. But the letter is of purely disciplinary character.

On June 20, 1894, Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical, *Praeclara gratulationis*, on the reunion of Christendom.[39] It was occasioned by the great number of letters received from all parts of the world, congratulating him on his Episcopal Jubilee of the previous year. It pained him to think of how many people were still outside the Church. Accordingly he set forth principles of Catholic Ecumenism.

Later, on June 20, 1896, Pope Leo issued another encyclical, the *Satis cognitum*, on the unity of the Church,[40] in which these Ecumenical principles were further developed. This letter was occasioned by his dealings with the Anglicans on the question of the value of their orders.

In the year 1919, Pope Benedict XV was approached by several Anglican notables from the United States, inviting him to take part in the coming preparatory conferences of the "World Conference on Faith and Order" to be held at Geneva on the following year. They were kindly received, but were told firmly about the Ecumenical teaching of the Church. As they left the audience copies of the decrees of 1864 and 1865 were placed in their hands.[41] On July 2 of the same year, the decision was given in the form of an answer to a *dubium* addressed to the Holy Office, in which it was held that the two decrees referred to were still in force.[42] Together with this *dubium* the two decrees were also republished.

In 1927, the question was revived in connection with the Lausanne meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order for which the earlier Geneva meeting was only preparatory. In another *dubium* proposed to the Holy Office, the answer of 1919 was reiterated.[43] Pope Pius XI issued an encyclical letter, the *Mortalium animos*, on January 6, 1928 which treated of the promotion of true Christian Unity.[44] This document contains much material on the subject of Catholic Ecumenism.

Under the Pontificate of Pope Pius XII, the Ecumenical Movement assumed even greater proportions. The World Council of Churches met at Amsterdam in the Fall of 1948. Prudence required that Catholics be again instructed on their basic principles of Ecumenism. Accordingly, a *Monitum* was issued by the Holy Office on June 5,

1948,[48] and this was followed by a fuller *Instruction* on December 20, 1949.[49] Finally, an encyclical letter, *Humani generis*, of August 12, 1950[50] contained, among other matters, a condemnation of "imprudent eirenicism."

All the documents to which we have referred could fall into two classes: those embodying doctrinal material; those that are purely disciplinary in character. The disciplinary phase is not within the scope of this dissertation.[51] We are merely concerned with the doctrinal material.

NOTES

[1] "... the true religion cannot be other than that which is founded in the revealed word of God. This revelation, inaugurated at the beginning of time and continued in the Old Testament, Christ Jesus Himself perfected in the New. Now if God has spoken, and that He has indeed spoken is proven by history, there is no one who does not see that it is man's duty to believe God absolutely in His revelations and to obey Him without qualifications in His commandments. Precisely that we might rightly fulfil both duties for the glory of God and our own salvation, the only Begotten Son of God founded His Church upon earth." Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 8; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity*, (Washington, D. C.: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1928), p. 5.

[2] Condemned proposition from *Lamentabili* of July 3, 1907: "Revelatio, objectum fidei catholicae constituens, non fuit cum Apostolis completa." cf. Henricus Denziger et al. *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, (Freiburg: Herder, 1937), no. 2021.

[3] Gal. 1:8.

[4] Vatican Council: *Constitutio de fide catholica*: "Hinc sacrorum quoque dogmatum is sensus perpetuo est retinendus, quem semel declaravit sancta mater Ecclesia, nec umquam ab eo sensu altioris intelligentiae specie et nomine recedendum. 'Crescat igitur . . . et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiae, aetatum ac saeculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia; sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu eademque sententia!'" see: Denziger, *op. cit.*, no. 1800 (The reference in quotation marks is from the *Commonitorium* of Vincent of Lerins no. 28, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, Migne, 1865) 50, 668.

[5] Vatican Council, *Constitutio de fide catholica*: "Haec porro supernaturalis revelatio . . . continetur in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut (ab) ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae, ad nos pervenerunt" . . . Denziger *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, *op. cit.*, 1787 see no. 783, see also 2 Thess. 2: 14.

[6] Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*: "The heavenly doctrine of Christ, although committed for the most part to writing by divine inspiration, could not unite the minds of men if left to the human intellect alone. It would, for this very reason, be subject to various and contradictory interpretations. This is so not only because of the nature of the doctrine itself and of the mysteries it involves, but also because of the divergencies of the human mind and of the disturbing element of contrary passions . . . Besides Holy Writ it was absolutely necessary to insure this union of men's minds . . . that there should

be another principle. This the wisdom of God requires: for He could not have willed that the faith should be *one* if He did not provide means sufficient for the preservation of this unity and this Holy Writ clearly sets forth . . ." *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutiones* (Paris: Desclee De Brouwer, 1900) VI, 164-165; Eng. tr.: John J. Wynne, S.J. ed., *The great encyclical letters of Pope Leo XIII*, (New York, Benziger, 1903) p. 360.

[7] Matt. 16:19.

[8] Luke 2:1 ". . . ἀπογραφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην." see Joseph M. Bover, ed., *Novi Testamenti Biblia Graeca et Latina*, (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas, 1943) *loc. cit.*

[9] Matt. 24:14: "καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν . . ." See Bover, *loc. cit.*

[10] ". . . καὶ πάσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας . . ." *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 8, 1; F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* (Tubingae: 1901) I, 320.

[11] "τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τοῦ κυρίου τὸ διὰ τῆς οἰκουμενικῆς συνόδου ἐν τῇ Νικαίᾳ γενόμενον μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." *Epistola ad Afros*, 2; *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris Migne, 1857) 26, 1032.

[12] Oliver S. Tomkins "The Anglican Communion and the Oecumenical Movement" in: E.R. Morgan and Roger Lloyd, *The Mission of the Anglican Communion* (London: S.P.C.K. & S.P.G., 1948) p. 108.

[13] Walter Marshall Horton, *Toward a Reborn Church* (New York: Harper, 1949) p. 9.

[14] Robert S. Bilheimer, *What must the Church do?* (New York: Harper, 1947) p. 81.

[15] H.G.G. Herklots and Henry Smith Leiper, *Pilgrimage to Amsterdam* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1947) p. 14.

[16] Charles Boyer, S.J., "Ecumenism and Conversions" in: *Unitas*, (Eng. Lang. Ed.) I, no. 2 (April-June, 1909) p. 4

[17] "Catholica enimvero vocatur (ecclesia), eo quod per totum orbem . . . . diffusa est; et quia universe et absque defectu docet omnia quae in hominum notitiam venire debent dogmata . . ." Catecheses, 18,23; *Patrologia Graeca*, *op. cit.*, 33, 1044

[18] Pope Benedict XV, *Maximum illud*, AAS, XI, 440; Eng. tr.: *Two encyclicals on foreign missions* (New York: America Press, 1944), p. 31.

[19] Pope Pius XI, *Rerum Ecclesiae*, AAS, XVIII, 65; Eng. tr.: *Two encyclicals on foreign missions*, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[20] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis*: *Allocutiones* V, 270; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

[21] "Tenenda est nobis christiana religio, et eius ecclesiae communicatio, quae catholica est, et catholica nominatur, non solum a suis, verum etiam ab omnibus inimicis. . . . Non enim possunt intelligi, nisi hoc eam nomine discernant, quo ab universo orbe nuncupatur." *De Vera Religione* 7, 12 *Patrologia Latina*, *op. cit.*, 34, 128.

[22] "ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit: unum tamen lumen est quod ubique diffunditur, nec unitas corporis separatur. Ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit, profluentes largiter rivos latius pandit: unum tamen caput est et origo una . . ." *De Catholicae Ecclesiae unitate* c. 5 *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Lantinorum*, *op. cit.*, 31, 213, Eng. tr.: J.R. Vassal-Phillips, tr., *St.*

Cyprian: On the unity of the Catholic Church, (St. Louis: Herder, 1924) p. 30.

[39] For a fuller treatment of this subject see: Kenneth Dougherty, S.A., *Ecclesia est theandrica ad instar Jesu Christi,* (Rome: Pont. Athanaeum Urbanianam de Propaganda fide, 1948) an S.T.D. dissertation as yet unpublished.

[40] "Christus enim totus cum membris suis est, propter ecclesiam, quae est corpus eius, plenitudo eius." St. Augustine, *Enchiridion,* 56, 61-62 *Patrologia Latina, op. cit.,* 40, 258.

[41] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis, AAS, XXXV,* pp. 199,218 Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: America Press, 1943) pp. 24-25.

[42] Pius XII, *ibid.* pp. 199, 218; Eng. tr. pp. 9, 24-25.

[43] Pius XII, *ibid.* p. 219; Eng. tr.: pp. 25-26.

[44] "Item diffinimus sanctam apostolicam sedem et Romanum pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium totiusque ecclesiae caput, et omnium christianorum patrem et doctorem existere; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi, ac gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenum potestatem traditum esse, quemadmodum etiam in gestis ycumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur." *Documenta concilii Florentini de unione orientalium: I de unione Graecorum,* 6 Julio, 1439 in: *Textus et Documenta series theologica,* n. 18 (Roma: Universitatis Gregorianae, 1935) p. 17 see Denziger, *Enchridion Symbolorum, op. cit.,* no. 694.

[45] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Allocutiones* VI, 175-6; Eng. tr.: p. 374.

[46] "Pater revelationem Filii Petro dedit; Filius vero et Patris et sui ipsius cognitionem per totum orbem illi disseminare commisit, ac mortali homini unicam in coelo potestatem dedit, dum claves illi tradidit, qui Ecclesiam per totum orbem terrarum extendit." St. John Chrysostom, *In Mattheo homilia,* 54, *Patrologia Graeca, op. cit.,* 58, 534-535. It is interesting to note in this connection the awareness of the Popes of this commission. For example, Pope Pius XI said to the members of the Superior Council of the Propagation of the Faith: "This task of the apostolate which is the evangelization of the whole world, is strictly, the pontificate's entire 'raison d'etre.' The entire Catholic tradition calls the Pope: Dominus Apostolicus: so truly is the apostolate the truest and most precious substance of the Roman Pontificate." quoted by: Joseph Etienne Champagne, O.M.I., *Manual of Missionary Action* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1948) p. 29.

[47] See, for example, Champagne *op. cit.* in previous note and J. Schmidlin, *Catholic Mission Theory* (Techny, Ill.: Mission Press, 1931).

[48] "Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui et sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisque alibi collegerit, spargit." *Epistola* 43, 5 *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, op. cit.,* 3, 2, 594.

[49] "It is well known that, in order to escape from the subjection to Papal authority, the following phrase was adopted at the time of the Reformation . . . "We who have separated ourselves recognize only Christ as the head of our Church " . . . Church communities have, in this respect, moved upon a declining path. At first, it was said by the Byzantines, "We recognize only Patriarchs, and each of these governing merely a portion of the Church; but no Pope, no head of the Patriarchs." Then came the English Church,

and it said, "Neither Popes nor Patriarchs, but merely Bishops." Upon their side, the Protestants of the Continent declared, "No bishops either, but merely pastors, and above them the sovereign of the country." Subsequently came the new Protestant sects of England with the declaration, "We have no need of pastors, but only preachers." Finally, appeared the "friends" (the Quakers) and many more communities who have made the discovery that "preachers also are only an evil, and that every man should be his own prophet, teacher and priest." Dr. Dollinger, *The Church and the Churches,* tr. W.B. MacCabe (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1862) pp. 40-41.

[50] I Kings (I Samuel) 8:7.

[51] I John 2:19.

[52] "Quotquot enim Dei et Jesu Christi sunt, hi sunt cum episcopo; et quotquot paenitentia ducti redierint ad unitatem ecclesiae, et hi Dei erunt, ut secundum Jesum Christum vivant. . . . Ne erretis, fratres mei: si quis schisma facientem sectatur, regni divini hereditatem non consequitur; si quis ambulat in aliena doctrina, cum passione non communicat." St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistola ad Philadelphenses,* 3, 2-3 Funk, *Patres Apostolici, op cit.,* I, 256.

[53] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos,* AAS, XX, 14; Eng. tr., p. 14.

[54] See, for example: Joseph Schweigl, "De unitate Ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis restituenda, Documenta S. Sedis ultimi saeculi, (1848-1938) illustrata" *Periodica,* XVIII (1939) pp. 209-233.

[55] Henry R.T. Brandreth, *The Oecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement* (London: S.P.C.K., 1947) p. 32.

[56] Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867) p. 138.

[57] Holy Office,*Apostolici Sedi,* ASS, II, 657-662.

[58] Brandreth, *Oecumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement, op. cit.,* p. 37.

[59] Holy Office, *Quod vos,* ASS., II, 662-668.

[60] Pope Pius IX, *Arcano divinae providentiae, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) col. 7-8.

[61] Pope Pius IX, *Jam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . concilii Vaticani, op. cit.,* col. 8-10.

[62] Pope Leo XIII, *Coetus in foederatis Americae, Allocutiones* VI, 97.

[63] J.H. Barrows, ed., *The World's Parliament of Religions* 2v., (Chicago: Parliament Publishing co., 1893).

[64] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Allocutiones* V, 272-285.

[65] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Allocutiones* VI, 156-169.

[66] *Report of the Deputation to Europe and the East* (New York: World Conference on Faith and Order, 1920) pp. 10-12.

[67] *AAS* XI, 309: also 310-316 for republished decrees.

[68] *AAS* XIX, 278.

[69] Pope Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, AAS,* XX, 5-16.

[70] *AAS* XL, 257.

[71] *AAS,* XLII, 142-147.

[72] AAS, XLII, 562-578.

[73] For the disciplinary aspect confer: S.J. Kelleher, *Discussions with non-Catholics* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1943).

CHAPTER TWO

Desire of the Holy See

Repeatedly through the centuries, the successive occupants of the Chair of Peter have consistently urged the return of the wandering sheep to the one fold which they had abandoned. That this has been most noteworthy during the past century is evidenced by the documents which we have enumerated. Through them all, a consistent note is observable, namely, the intense desire of the Holy See for the reunion of Christendom.[1]

Papal Zeal

On the part of the Popes themselves, they are very conscious of their obligation to seek this reunion. Pius IX said:

> We . . . who must fulfil with the greatest zeal all the functions of a good shepherd, and love with a paternal love and embrace in our charity all men wherever dispersed over the earth, address these letters to all Christians separated from us, and we again and again exhort and conjure them to return quickly to the one fold of Christ . . . we fear to have one day to render an account to Him who is our Judge, if we do not show them and prepare for them, as far as is in our power, the way to attain eternal salvation.[2]

This obligation is one of justice, because, in virtue of his office, the Pope is the vicegerent of Christ and the commission to "make disciples of all nations" rests upon his shoulders primarily and formally. Hence, the Pope is aware that he must use every right means to fulfil the command of Him whose place he holds on earth.

On the other hand, the Pope is impelled to seek this reunion by reasons of Divine Charity. Pope Leo XIII declared:

> . . . We feel drawn to follow the example of Our Divine Redeemer and Master, Jesus Christ, who, when about to return to heaven, implored of God, His Father, in earnest prayer, that His disciples

> and followers should be of one mind and of one heart. . . . And as this divine prayer and supplication does not include only the souls who then believed in Jesus Christ, but also every one of those who were henceforth to believe in Him, this prayer holds out to us no indifferent reason for confidently expressing our hopes, and for making all possible endeavors in order that men of every race and clime should be called and moved to embrace the unity of divine faith.[3]

However, this obligation is not unilateral. The Popes, indeed, realize their obligation to seek this reunion of Christendom, but, at the same time, there is a corresponding obligation on the part of the non-Catholic world to seek it, too. In 1868, Pius IX pointed out to an objective fact which is being verified in the events of contemporary history: "On this longed-for return to the truth and unity of the Catholic Church depends the salvation, not only of individuals, but still more of the whole Christian society; and the whole world cannot enjoy true peace, unless there shall be one fold and one shepherd."[4]

This obligation is not only an imperative course of action, by reason of an impending crisis which threatens the very existence of Christian society, but also because it derives from the explicit command of Christ. Leo XIII wrote:

> If those about to come back to their most loving Mother (not yet fully known or culpably abandoned) should perceive that their return involves not indeed the shedding of their blood (at which price nevertheless the Church was bought by Jesus Christ) but some lesser trouble and labor, let them clearly understand that this burden has been laid on them not by the will of man but by the will and command of God.[5]

Sincere Charity

The earnest desire for reunion on the part of the Holy See is also evidenced by the kindness with which it received any invitation which was addressed to it on the part of dissidents. By reason of divine truth, which might be compromised, the Holy See has, indeed, refused to participate in certain meetings. But the expression of desire for right reunion has always accompanied the refusal. Thus, to the Anglican unionists, the Holy Office wrote the following:

> May the Holy Spirit vouchsafe to fulfil and perfect without delay what He has begun in you by that good will towards the Church

which He has imparted to you. And this, in union with the Sacred Congregation, our most holy lord, Pope Pius IX, desires with all his heart; and earnestly beseeches from the God of mercies and Father of lights that all of you at length, escaping from your severed, disinherited condition into the inheritance of Christ, the true Catholic Church, to which unquestionably your forefathers belonged before the deplorable separation of the sixteenth century, may happily attain the root of charity in the bond of peace and fellowship of unity.*

Indeed, the Holy See itself took the initiative on a number of occasions to invite the non-Catholic world to consider the plan of Christ as regards the unity of His Church. For example, when convoking the Vatican Council, Pius IX wrote an encyclical, "*Ad omnes Protestantes, aliosque acatholicos*" in which he urged: "Let all those, then, who do not profess the unity and truth of the Catholic Church avail themselves of the opportunity of this Council . . . (to) satisfy the longing of their hearts, and liberate themselves from that state in which they cannot be assured of their own salvation."*
Leo XIII also addressed his invitation thus:

Suffer that we should invite you to the unity which has ever existed in the Catholic Church and can never fail; suffer that we should lovingly hold out our hand to you. The Church, as the common Mother of all, has long been calling you back to her; the Catholics of the world await you with brotherly love, that you may render holy worship to God together with us, united in perfect charity by the profession of one gospel, one faith and one hope.*

Firm Faith

In spite of such eloquent appeals for the reunion of Christendom, the Holy See has never lessened the firmness of its teachings or the unqualified presentation of conditions of reunion. This has been misunderstood and resented in many quarters of the non-Catholic religious world. Such, for example, could be found in the following report of a subcommittee on reunion for the Lambeth Conference of 1920:

We cannot do better than make our own the words of the report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfillment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past . . . " But we realize that—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove." Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of reunion we shall be ready to welcome such discussions.*

The same document goes on looking with hope towards certain movements, "which may be fruitful in the future." One movement to which reference is made was the possibility of certain French Catholic groups going into schism in view of setting up an "independent Gallican Church." Unity by way of schism!

The Holy See desires reunion by the way of Divinely revealed truth alone. To compromise that truth in the least way is to betray Jesus Christ and the Divine constitution of His Church. The Holy Office in 1865 counselled the Anglican unionists, ". . . you must beware lest in seeking it (unity), you turn aside from the way."*
Pope Pius XII, addressing a group of German Catholics, declared:

We know how urgent among many of your people, Catholics as well as non-Catholics, is the aspiration towards unity in the faith. And who could feel more intensely this desire than the Vicar of Christ Himself? The Church surrounds the dissidents from the faith with "sincere love" and with the warmth of prayers for the accomplishment of their return to their Mother, from whom God knows how many are distant without any personal guilt. If the Church is inflexible before all that could have even the appearance of compromise, or of an adjustment of the Catholic Faith with other confessions, or of its mixture and confusion with them, it is because she knows that there has always been and always will be one sole infallible and sure rock of the whole truth and of the fullness of grace come to her from Christ: and that this rock, according to the explicit will of our Divine Founder, is herself and simply herself."

What resentful non-Catholics appear to be unable to see is the fact that the very immutability of the Catholic Faith and constitution is the best guarantee of a secure reunion of Christendom. A discerning Anglican writer, Spencer Jones, pointed out:

From this point of view, instead of saying that she is hopeless because she will not change we ought to say that the fact of Rome's not changing is proved to be an abiding fact and must be reckoned with as such. . . . In the same way I should say that the proper function of the Anglican Church and also of the Dissenting bodies is to change and to move, since this is in fact what they have ever done. . . . One of her own communion has stated the case for us . . . "It is," he observes, "a startling paradox but an equally certain truth, that in the very 'obstinacy' of Rome lies all hope of reunion.

Without it all hope of reunion would be impossible. Without it the very elements of Unity would be hopelessly destroyed. . . ."[12]

St. Peter wrote, "we have the word of prophecy, surer still, to which you do well to attend, as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts."[13] His successors in the same office address the same words to the divided world of today. In their ecumenical documents, we find several specific recommendations, *viz.*, prayer and study.

Prayer and Study

Pius IX urged all non-Catholics to pray for unity:

Let all those, then, who do not profess the truth and unity of the Catholic Church . . . unceasingly offer prayers to the God of mercy, that He will throw down the wall of separation, that He will scatter the darkness of error, and that He will lead them back to the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church, in whom the whole doctrine of Jesus Christ is preserved and handed down, and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed.[14]

On the other hand, Catholics are urged to pray for this hoped-for reunion. In 1908, one Paul James Francis Wattson, S.A., founder of a religious community in the Episcopal Church instituted the "Church Unity Octave" a period of prayer (Jaunary 18-25th) which had for its object the restoration of all dissidents to communion with the Chair of Peter. A short time afterwards he and his Community, the Society of the Atonement, were received into the Church.[15] This Octave (now known as *The Chair of Unity Octave*) was given immediate approval of Pope Pius X. Later on September 25, 1916, Pope Benedict XV wrote an Apostolic Brief, extending it to world-wide observance and enriching it with indulgences. In this brief, he declared:

In every age it has been the concern of the Roman Pontiffs . . . that Christians who have unfortunately withdrawn from the Catholic religion should at length be recalled to it as to a forsaken Mother . . . With a glad mind we have heard from the Society which is called "of the Atonement" established in New York, that prayers have been recited from the feast of the Chair of Blessed Peter at Rome to the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul, in order that unity might be obtained from the Lord and at the same time we rejoiced that these prayers, blessed by Pope Pius the Tenth, and approved by

the Bishops of America, have been circulated far and wide through the United States. And so, in order that the prayers above mentioned may be offered to God everywhere and with abundant fruit of souls . . . we . . . grant and bestow in the Lord a Plenary indulgence . . ."

In addition to prayer, non-Catholics are also urged to examine earnestly and honestly the security of their position and the position of the Catholic Church. Pius IX said:

. . . we cannot refrain from addressing our Apostolic and paternal words to all those who, whilst they know the same Jesus Christ as the Redeemer, and who glory in the name of Christian, yet do not profess the true faith, nor hold to and follow the communion of the Catholic Church . . . in order to admonish and to conjure, and beseech them, with all the warmth of our zeal and in all charity, to consider and seriously examine whether they follow the path marked out for them by Jesus Christ our Lord, which leads to eternal salvation."

There can be no question, then, but that the Holy See desires the reunion of Christendom. The theme of the Amsterdam Assembly was: "Man's disorder and God's design;" the Holy See points to God's design as something immutable and perpetual as well as easily discoverable. That design transcends all human genius, because it is the ordinance of the Incarnate Wisdom of God. Departure from the Divine pattern bespeaks a shipwreck of the Christian faith and destruction of all hope for the true reunion of Christendom. The Holy See is unwilling to pay such a price for a reunion, however nobly its conception be expressed and however ingeniously planned on a human level, when the promises of Christ are set aside and the ordinance of God ignored.

NOTES

[1] Holy Office, *Quod eos*: "Quemadmodum Apostolica Petri sedes cum Catholica ecclesia exultat si quos noverit, qui a recto tramite deflexerint matremque suam derelinquerint, ad ejus sinum regredi velle: ita eosdem aegro animo repellere cogi, qui veram realemque catholicam non quaerunt unitatem. "Proposition I of official summary at end of *Quod eos* letter of 1865, *Acta Sancta Sedis*, II, 668.

[2] Pius IX, *Jam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . . Concilii Vaticani* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) 9; Eng. tr.: David Lewis (ed.) *The Year of preparation for the Vatican Council* (London: Burns, Oates, 1869) pp. 56-57.

[3] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Leonis XIII Papae Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutiones* (Paris: Desclee, 1900) V. 273.

[4] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . Concilii Vaticani*, Col 9; Eng. tr., p. 57.

[5] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Allocutiones* VI, 156; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903) pp. 350-351.

[6] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, 667; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, 1867) p. 246.

[7] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . Concilii Vaticani*, Col. 9; Eng. tr., p. 56.

[8] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Allocutiones*, V, 279; Eng. tr., p. 311.

[9] *The Lambeth Conferences* (1867-1930). (London: S.P.C.K., 1948) p. 128.

[10] Holy Office, *Quod vos*: "Cavendum tamen vobis est, ne ipsam quaerentes deflectatis a via . . ." *ASS*, II, 662. Commenting on this document, Cardinal Manning notes: " . . . as the Holy Office affirms, there is no unity possible except by way of truth. Truth first, unity afterwards; truth the cause, unity the effect. To invert this order is to overthrow the Divine procedure. The unity of Babel ended in confusion; the unity of Pentecost fused all nations in one Body by the one dogma of faith . . . Truth alone generates unity." *England and Christendom op. cit.*, p. 160.

[11] *Osservatore Romano*, Nov. 9, 1948 Quoted by Charles Boyer, S.J. "The Amsterdam assembly and the Ecumenical movement." *Unitas* (English Language Edition), V. I, n. 1 (Jan.-Mar. 1949) p. 11 Apropos of this is Cardinal Wiseman's statement of his method when dealing with the Oxford Tractarians: " . . . At the same time, a serious danger has to be avoided. No concessions could be made to error, beyond the acknowledgement of sincere belief that it was unconscious. To have allowed it (the Anglican Establishment) to possess a single mark or element of Catholicity . . . would have been both false in theology and pernicious in practice. It would have encouraged a fatal delusion, which, undisturbed, might have laid many asleep in a fatal contentment, who now repose in peaceful security in the bosom of their Mother, the Church. No real love for those involved in this state could be shown, except by energetic endeavors to snatch them from it. Whoever, therefore, wished to be truly their best friend, had to make up his mind to appear their most unrelenting opponent." *Essays on various subjects* (London: Charles Dolman, 1853) II, vii-viii.

[12] Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See* (London: Longmans, Green 1902), pp. 31-34 *passim*.

[13] 2 Pet. 2:19.

[14] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . concilii Vaticani*, Col 8; Eng. tr., p. 56.

[15] For a complete story, see: David Gannon, S.A. *Father Paul of Graymoor* (New York: Macmillan, 1951) pp. 136-149, 256-283.

[16] Benedict XV, *Romanorum Pontificum*, AAS, IX, 61-62; Eng. tr.: Gannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor*, pp. 257-258.

[17] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . concilii Vaticani*, Col. 8; Eng. tr., p. 53.

Introduction

Some pages back we have defined the special sense of Catholic Ecumenism which we are using in this dissertation: *"Catholic Ecumenism, in its special sense, is that divinely commanded and divinely sustained work of reconciliation, which has for its object the conversion and return of baptized dissidents to the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ, which involves their acceptance of the faith and communion of the See of Peter and the Catholic Church throughout the world."* The definition was formulated so as to embrace the basic phases included within the notion of ecumenism. In this section we shall be concerned with unfolding the content of this notion.

When one considers the problem of the reunion of Christendom, three main lines of study are opened up: The first would be to examine the precise goal to be aimed at in any movement of this kind. The second would be to determine the actual starting point of such a movement. The third would be to discover the means or way from the starting point to the goal.

The non-Catholic "ecumenist" has, as yet, no definite answer to these questions. The technique known as "comprehension" cultivates a studied vagueness in expression seeking to encompass disparate and even contradictory ideas, interlarded with rhetorical effusion, in a form acceptable to all. Originating, as it does in the cardinal principle of protestantism of "the right and duty of private judgement," it seeks to resolve the division while preserving the cause. It is hardly a help towards clarity and definiteness; it is a positive obstacle to a consideration of the real issues as it is also of the actual attainment of the true reunion of Christendom.

On the other hand, the Catholic Ecumenist has definite answers to each of these essential questions without which no true movement towards the reunion of Christendom could be initiated or terminated.

CHAPTER ONE

The Goal of Reunion

1. THE UNICITY OF THE CHURCH

The foundation of the discussion of Catholic Ecumenism must repose in the fact that the Church of Christ is one and only one.[1] Antecedently to any other consideration, the explicit declarations of Scripture and the assurance of common sense requires that it be so. Whether one approaches the question from the angle of Protestant ecumenism which envisions its objective as reunion *of* the Church, or from the Catholic angle which looks for reunion *with* the Church, the starting point must be the fact that "there is but one Church of Jesus Christ."[2]

Admitted by All

Non-Catholic Ecumenism, even though the statement involves it in contradictions, most emphatically asserts that the Church of Christ is numerically one. As Angus Dun notes:

> . . . there is that in all the churches which stands in contradiction to their plurality and divisions. They carry in their divided life that which brings them under judgement. Being many and divided, they all speak of THE CHURCH in the singular. Many of them treasure and use ancient creeds in which they constantly reaffirm, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church" or "one Catholic and Apostolic Church" . . . The churches constantly confess the Church . . . by a tragic inadvertence did they become divided from that beyond themselves which they recognized as true Church.[3]

At the World Council of Churches meeting at Amsterdam, the General Secretary, W. A. Visser't Hooft expressed the difficulty as follows: "This is the dilemma which dominates the whole existence of the Council. Its member Churches are as yet unable to *be* together the one Church of God, but they are no longer able to

regard their fellow-members as being outside the Church of God. They cannot unite, but neither can they let each other go. . . ."[4]

There is, then, in the abstract, no difference between the Catholic and the non-Catholic ecumenist on the unicity of the Church. Pius XI remarked that, "They who profess themselves Christians cannot, we think, but believe in Christ's establishment of one Church and only one."[5] Leo XIII said:

> . . . by the will of its Founder, it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and at all times. To justify the existence of more than one Church, it would be necessary to go outside this world, and to create a new and unheard-of race of men. That the one Church should embrace all men everywhere and at all times was seen and foretold by Isaias . . . "And in the last days the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of the mountains." (Is. 2:2) But this mountain which towers over all other mountains is *one*; and the house of the Lord to which all nations shall come to seek the rule of living is also *one*. (Is. 2:2-3.)[6]

One Founder and Purpose

The numerical oneness of the Church is easily inferred from its efficient and final cause. It has one Founder: Jesus Christ, and one goal: the perpetuation of His Redemptive work. Leo XIII tells us:

> And since it was necessary that His divine mission should be perpetuated to the end of time, He took to Himself disciples, trained by Himself, and made them partakers of His own authority. And, when He had invoked upon them from heaven the Spirit of Truth, He bade them go through the whole world and faithfully preach to all nations what He had taught and what He had commanded, so that by the profession of His doctrine, and the observance of His laws, the human race might attain to holiness on earth and never-ending happiness in heaven. In this wise and on this principle, the Church was begotten.[7]

The Pontiff, in a few words, compresses the historical origins of the Church of Christ. Having come to gather into one all the children of God, the Saviour of the world gradually unfolded to His followers the grand conception of God's design. Pius XI tells us that, "He likened His Church to a kingdom, to a house, to a sheepfold, to a flock."[8] Thus he envisioned the corporate embodiment of His design as a single society, distinct and discernible from all others. The end to which He orientated the activities of this society is

completely supernatural; the historical continuation of His Personal mission. This society alone is properly ecumenical in that it is to spread throughout the whole world. When the Spirit of Truth was invoked upon the Apostles, the society was endowed with potential, or juridical, ecumenicity; under divine providence, it has attained actual ecumenicity. By reason of its supernatural character, the means it employs are proportionate and apt for the mission it has been given. Its mission is formally and fundamentally identical with that of Christ, hence its authority derives its efficacy from the same source: "As the living Father has sent me, so I also send you."[9] The Church is one, then, because it has a single Founder and a single purpose; it is only one, because to one society alone was given the commission, means and authority proportionate to a supernatural end.

One Exemplar and Head

While, of their nature, the efficient and final causes of any reality are distinct notionally and really from that of which they are the causes, yet the ontological configuration of the thing produced will reflect both the agent and the end insofar as it embodies the exemplar according to which it was made. As the proximate efficient cause of the Church, Jesus Christ did not merely call the first members, propose the goal to be achieved by corporate action and furnish them with the means necessary to achieve it and then let it function according to His instructions. He continues His causality by reason of the fact that He is both Head and Exemplar of the Church, sustaining it in existence, energizing it by His vital action and configuring it to Himself; wherefore the Church is called His Mystical Body. Pope Leo XIII said:

> . . . because it is the body of Christ it is living and energizing, because by the infusion of His power Christ guards and sustains it, just as the vine gives nourishment and renders fruitful the branches united to it . . . As Christ, the Head and exemplar, is not wholly in His visible human nature . . . nor wholly in the invisible divine nature . . . but is one in both natures, visible and invisible; so the Mystical Body of Christ is the true Church only because its visible parts draw life and power from the supernatural gifts and other things whence spring their very nature and essence."[10]

> "Another head like to Christ must be invented—that is, another Christ—if besides the one Church, which is His Body, men wish to set up another."[11]

One Divine Life and One Visible Society

The Church is numerically one also by reason of its quasi-formal cause, i.e., the Holy Ghost and by reason of its material cause, i.e., its visible membership. But these are more logically treated under the heading of unity, which forms the topic of the next article.

Perpetual Indefectibility

This unicity of the Church of Christ forms an essential part of Catholic Ecumenism. However, it should be noted, the Church was not only numerically one from the will and intention of Christ, but also that it has ever been one and shall be one until the end of time. Pius XI notes:

> So marvelously constituted a Church could not cease altogether and be extinguished when its Founder and the Apostles who first propagated it had died, for it had been commanded to lead to eternal salvation all men without distinction of time or place: "Going therefore forth, teach all nations." Would the Church lack power of efficacy in the perpetual fulfillment of its work when Christ Himself, as He solemnly promised, is with it forever? "Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world." Necessarily, therefore, the Church of Christ ought not only to exist today and always, but still more, be the same as it was in the Apostolic ages, unless we should utter the absurdity that Christ Our Lord either was not adequate to His purpose or had erred when He asserted that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."[12]

So essential is this unicity of the Church that those who leave it forfeit the promises made to the Church and are wanting in essential means of salvation: "The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same forever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition."[13]

2. *UNITY OF THE CHURCH*

From the last article, it can be seen that the unicity of the Church is the fulcrum and ground of Catholic Ecumenism. No hope for the reunion of Christendom can be essayed without taking this into account. This fact, as we have noted, is also perceived by the non-Catholic Ecumenist. To ignore this fact is to enter into the

realm of unreality supported neither by Scripture, history nor common sense.

On the other hand, no less important is the question of unity. Now, unity differs notionally from unicity in this respect: that unicity opposes plurality, whereas unity opposes division. The Catholic Ecumenist declares that, just as it is impossible than that there should be several churches of Christ, so also it is impossible that the Church of Christ be divided.

Non-Catholic Orientation

Many non-Catholic ecumenists also affirm not only the existence of but one Church, but the actual unity of that Church as well. But they conceive of the "Church" as an entity which contains the sects. As one writer put it:

> She is *one*, and in spite of divisions knows herself as one because her head is one and the Spirit indwelling her is one. . . . In spite of the obscuring of that unity in the empirical "churches," the common belief in the Person of the one Christ is forcing believers in Him to seek to actualize the unity which belongs to the Church by virtue of its one Head, in whom it is God's purpose to gather all things together into one."

Taken within its own frame of reference, this statement embodies several manifest contradictions: The Church is said to be one entitatively even though it be contained in constitutionally distinct communities with contradictory teachings; at the same time and under the same aspect, it is both actually and potentially one: the one Head and one Spirit make her one actually, yet she is not one except potentially, being gravely divided in faith and rule.

Catholic Orientation

The foregoing citation has been given as an illustration by way of contrast to the doctrine which is here set forth. The Catholic Ecumenist affirms that unity is a perpetual visible token of the Church, to such an extent that the Church is incapable of division. There have been separations *from* the Church, but no division *of* the Church itself. Leo XIII declared, "*qui unicam condidit, is idem condidit unam,*"

> But He, indeed, who made this one Church, also gave it unity, that is, He made it such that all who are to belong to it must be united by the closest bonds, so as to form one society, one kingdom, one body . . . He commanded that this unity should be so closely knit and so perfect amongst His followers that it might in some measure, shadow forth the union between Himself and His Father."

Comparison of the Two Approaches

Catholic Ecumenism looks out from a position of unity in possession; non-Catholic Ecumenism looks for unity not as yet possessed. Hence, their approach to the question is considerably different. The non-Catholic looks for theories and means of obtaining unity, while the Catholic aims to share a divinely-given unity which already exists. But the primary question is, not how unity can be achieved, but how Christ established it. God's design was complete and set in motion by Christ Himself, who continues to sustain His work and there is no evidence to show that He has changed His mind:

> Not the foundation of the Church alone, but its whole constitution, belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's free choice. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done. We must consequently investigate not how the Church might possibly be one, but how He, who founded it, willed that it should be one."

Unity is Essential

Now, when one examines the explicit statements and various metaphors of Sacred Scripture, which set forth the Church of Christ, he cannot help but observe that the note of unity is essential to it." Moreover, since the Church is divine in origin and support, there cannot be wanting to that Church the means necessary to preserve it in the character in which it has been given:

> For this reason we find it called in holy writ by names indicating a perfect society. It is spoken of as the *house of God*, the *city placed on a mountain* to which all nations must come; but it is also the *fold* presided over by one Shepherd, and into which all Christ's sheep must betake themselves. Yea, it is called the *kingdom* which God has raised up and which will stand forever. Finally it is the *Body of Christ*—that is, of course, His *Mystical* Body, but a body living and duly organized and composed of many members; members indeed which have not all the same functions, but which, united

one to the other, are kept bound together by the guidance and authority of the head."

So essential is this note of unity, that, without it, there cannot be one Church of Christ. Where it is found in all its fullness and supernatural splendor, there alone will be the one Church; by this token it is distinct from all the sects. Moreover, to this alone is conjoined the note of ecumenicity in space and time: *diffused* throughout the whole world and abiding until the end of time. The Holy Office noted:

If, indeed, you will examine the matter with care, and dispassionately consider it, evident proofs will show that this unity of faith and charity—that is, of communion—*is*, by the immutable institution of Christ, not only a chief and fundamental attribute of the Church, but a note, sure and ever visible, whereby the Church herself is securely and easily to be distinguished from all sects . . . As, then, the Church of Christ is Catholic, and is called so, by virtue of that supreme unity of faith and communion which, diffused as she is through all the nations and all time, she still firmly maintains; so, in virtue of that same unity, is she entitled Holy and Apostolic; and as without such unity she would cease, *de jure* and *de facto*, to be Catholic, so she would lose at once the attributes of sanctity and apostolic succession."

Visibility of This Unity

This unity of the one Church is not some indefinite sentiment, but a concrete reality corporately embodied in a visibly constituted society. It is closely knit together by intellectual and moral bonds actuated by the perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost. In vain, is it asserted: "All must surely desire to hasten the day when the members of the one Church shall be at peace with one another, and united in the external bonds of one visible communion."[5] If the Church is one society, it must be one in the social collaboration of its members pursuing the same goal under the same head. It must, likewise, not only be materially visible as a society of Christians, but formally visible as the one society of Christ. Visible unity is not a mere *desideratum*, but a patent fact deriving from the very essence of the Church itself. Pius XI declared:

Indeed, a great many deny, for example that Christ's Church ought to be visible; at least in the sense that it should stand forth as one body of faithful united in one identical doctrine and under one

authority and rule. On the contrary, they understand by a visible Church nothing but a society formed by various Christian communities even though these adhere to different and even mutually contradictory doctrines. Instead Christ Our Lord founded His Church as a perfect society, external of its own nature and perceived by the senses, which would pursue for all future time the task of saving mankind through the guidance of one head, through being taught by a living voice, and through the dispensation of the sacraments, as fountains of the grace of heaven."

The witness of Scripture to the fact of this visible unity of the one Church is chiefly born in the designation, "Body of Christ."[6] Pope Leo XIII says:

. . . precisely because it is a body is the Church visible. . . . And as in animals the vital principle is unseen and invisible, and is evidenced and manifested by the movements and actions of the members, so the principle of the supernatural life in the Church is clearly shown in that which is done by it. . . . The union, consequently, of visible and invisible elements, because it harmonizes with the natural order and by God's will belongs to the very essence of the Church, must necessarily remain so long as the Church itself shall endure."[7]

The above passage indicates the vital link between Head and members, soul and body, invisible and visible, as the indivisible substratum of the living Church of Christ. Now Pius XII fills in the picture in terms of social manifestation:

Our union in and with Christ is first evident from the fact that, since Christ wishes His Christian Community to be a Body which is a perfect society, its members must be united because they all work together towards a single end. . . . Now since this social Body of Christ has been designed by its Founder to be visible, this cooperation of all its members must also be externally manifest through the profession of the same faith, and their sharing in the same sacred rites, through participation in the same sacrifice and practical observance of the same laws."[8]

This social embodiment of unity must, moreover, possess and preserve that specific form with which its Divine Founder endowed it. "The true union of Christians is that which Jesus Christ, the Author of the Church, instituted and desired, and which consists in a unity of faith and government."[9] These are the chief visible tokens of unity; implicit in them are the other features of unity of worship and intercommunion.

Unity of Faith

The profession of the one faith is essential to the one Church of Christ. No hope can be entertained for a true Christian unity which leaves this out of account. How could that be one Body which was not of one mind with itself and its Head? How could the Holy Spirit, who informs the Body, be uniformly the origin of and witness to contradictory teachings? What a monstrous caricature of the Body of Christ can be seen in the following: "The living Church of which Christ is the living head transcends all denominational "churches" and includes the whole community of those who acknowledge his Lordship. . . . The fellowship of the ecumenical church transcends all ethical, doctrinal and organizational differences. . . ." This conception is, to say the least, essentially opposed to the plain teaching of the Scripture. How different is the Catholic Ecumenist approach on the same theme; Leo XIII points out:

> Agreement and union of minds is the necessary foundation of the perfect concord amongst men, from which the concurrence of wills and similarity of action are the natural results. Wherefore, in His divine wisdom, He ordained in His Church unity of Faith; . . . one Lord, one faith one baptism . . . And so, the Apostle St. Paul not merely begs but entreats and implores Christians to be all of the same mind, and to avoid differences of opinions: "I beseech you brethren, by the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms amongst you, and that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgement."

Moreover, this unanimous profession of the one faith has for its object the total content of Divine revelation. The formal motive of faith is the truthfulness of God revealing. Hence, *all* the teachings of Christ must receive unconditional assent by *all* the members of the one Church. The quality of that assent extends equally to every revealed truth distributively taken or to the whole body of truth collectively taken. To deny one single truth that God has revealed, even though one accepts all the rest, is equivalent to calling God a liar. Pius XI observes:

> In matters of faith it is not permitted to make a distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, as if the first ought to be held by all and the second, the faithful are free to accept or not. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal cause the authority of God the Revealer, which suffers not such a division. . . . For has not God revealed them all?"

Unity of Government

In addition to the unity of faith, unity of government is also essential to the one Church of Christ. The Church is a perfect society. Hence, nothing is wanting to it which is necessary for the accomplishment of its mission. Now, its mission of teaching and sanctifying mankind cannot be realized unless, conjoined to the command of Christ, there was given to it the means necessary to carry out His will. There can be no question, then, of the fact that such as Christ willed, such was done. One non-Catholic writer notes:

> Whenever individuals unite for any purpose whatever, there must necessarily be some kind of organization and government. Without some kind of government an organization cannot permanently exist. . . . Out of the ruins of the primitive Church arose the great pyramid of the Roman hierarchy . . . The great strength of Rome . . . lies in the form of its government. Therein lies the explanation of why the ecclesiastical empire of Rome has outlived all secular empires."

This writer reveals a more than usual discernment in perceiving the need of a government to preserve the existence of the Church and his observation as to the unconquered stability of the Roman Church is most apt. However, he errs gravely in assuming that the primitive Church fell into ruins; such a statement is an unconscious blasphemy against Christ, presuming, as it seems, that His divine promises were in vain. The stability of the Roman Church does not only lie in the form of its government, but also in the fact that it retains the form which Christ gave to the Church and through which form Christ still exercises His divine authority and priestly office. The very fact of its stability bears witness to its divine character. Leo XIII said:

> For by the will and ordinance of God, its Founder, it is a society perfect in its kind . . . therefore it is endowed with a living power and efficacy which is not derived from any external source, but in virtue of the ordinance of God and its own constitution, inherent in its very nature. . . ." Wherefore Jesus Christ bade all men, present and future, follow Him as their leader and Saviour; and this not merely as individuals, but as forming a society, organized and united in mind. In this way a duly constituted society should exist, formed out of the divided multitudes of peoples, one in faith, one in end, one in the participation of means adapted to the attainment of the end, and one as subject to one and the same authority. To this end He established in the Church all those principles which necessarily tend

to make organized human societies, and through which they attain the perfection proper to each."

It should be apparent from the foregoing passages that the unity of government, which is essential to the one Church of Christ, is not any kind of polity which may be found suitable at any given age or place, but only that precise kind of unity which Christ Himself gave to the Church and which He willed to remain until the end of time. Referring to the conjunction of the invisible and visible elements of the Church, Leo XIII declares: "But since the Church is *such* by divine will and constitution, *such* it must uniformly remain to the end of time. If it did not, then it would not have been founded as perpetual and the end set before it would have been limited to some certain place and to some certain period of time: both of which are contrary to the truth."[8]

It is a contradiction to say that the Church is one inwardly, yet many outwardly. Note the following:

> . . . Recall, then, I say, what church unity means. It does not mean outward uniformity of creed or polity . . . On the other hand, church unity does mean inward, organic, so to speak, divinely biological life, wherein all the varities of organs and functions are vitally convergent to one end. You can organize an external organization —that is man's work. You cannot organize an internal organism—that is God's work."[9]

Both the outward organization and the inward life are God's work. "Scattered and separated members cannot possibly cohere with the head so as to make one body."[10] Pius XII wrote:

> . . . how grievously they err who arbitrarily picture the Church as something hidden and invisible, as do they also who look upon it as a mere human institution with a certain disciplinary code and external ritual, but lacking power to communicate supernatural life . . . For this reason we deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of Society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction which they introduce is baseless. For they fail to understand that the same reason that led our Divine Redeemer to give to the community of men He founded the constitution of a society, perfect of its kind, containing all the juridical and social elements, namely, that He might perpetuate on earth the saving work of Redemption, was also the reason why He wished it be enriched with the heavenly gifts of the Consoling Spirit . . . There

can, then, be no real opposition or conflict between the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit and the juridical commission of Ruler and Teacher received from Christ. Like body and soul in us, they complement and perfect each other, and have their source in our one Redeemer, who not only said, as He breathed on the Apostles, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit," but also clearly commanded, "As the Father hath sent me, so I send you;" and again, "He who heareth you, heareth me."[11]

Unity of Worship

Closely annexed to this unity of faith and government is the unity of divine worship whereby the whole Body of Christ, Head and members, offers true and acceptable honor to God. Through it, too, all the members partake of the divine life by the use of divinely given means of salvation. Pius XII noted:

> . . . the divine Redeemer has so willed it that the priestly life begun with the supplication and sacrifice of His mortal Body should continue without intermission down the ages in His Mystical Body which is the Church. . . . Thus the society founded by the divine Redeemer, whether in her doctrine or government, or in the sacrifice and sacraments instituted by Him, or finally in the ministry, which He has confided to her charge with the outpouring of His prayer and the shedding of His blood, has no other purpose than to increase ever in strength and unity. . . . The sacred liturgy is, consequently, the public worship which our Redeemer as Head of the Church renders to the Father, as well as the worship which the community of the faithful renders to its Founder, and through Him to the heavenly Father. It is, in short, the worship rendered by the Mystical Body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members."[12]

Implied in this declaration is the fact that the one Church of Christ alone offers this fit and acceptable public worship to God: "The Church alone offers to the human race that religion—that state of absolute perfection—which He wished, as it were, to be *incorporated* in it. And it alone supplies those means of salvation which accord with the ordinary counsels of Providence."[13]

Perpetual Indivisibility

Certainly, that Church which is, and ever has been, numerically one and perfectly one in faith, government and worship and which has Christ for its Head and the Holy Spirit for its soul, must as a necessary consequence be infallible and indefectable in this unity

and ecumenicity. How else could it fulfill its ecumenical mission of instructing the nations and image forth the divinely given unity until the end of time? If Christ teaches through the Church, how could it err? If the Church is the Body of Christ, how could it be divided?

Its unity, however, the Church of Christ has never lost; never, for the briefest interval of time, will lose: forasmuch as, by the divine oracles, the Church is to endure forever. But how can its perpetual duration be believed, if the succession of ages bring about new aspects and form in its essential condition, even as the changeful things of this world; and if the Church itself could at any time lapse so far from that unity of faith and communion in which it was founded by Jesus Christ and then propagated by the Apostles? . . . Now, if the Church of Christ be altogether indefectible, it follows at once that it is to be asserted and believed infallible also in pounding the doctrines of the Gospel. And that Christ our Lord, by a wonderful gift, has bestowed on the Church, of which He is Himself the Head, the Bridegroom, and the Corner-stone, this prerogative of infallibility, is a fixed dogma of the Catholic faith. What man of sound mind, indeed, could persuade himself that error might lurk in the Church's public and authoritative office as teacher, instituted by Christ to this very end, that we should not now be children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive; and which He promised should never be destitute of His own presence, and should be taught all truth by the Holy Ghost: through which He willed that all nations should be called to the obedience of faith, and be taught what to believe and what to do; so that he should be condemned who would not believe the preaching of the Apostles and their lawful successors; and to which He gave the function and authority to prescribe the form of sound words, wherein all who are taught of God should unite? Hence St. Paul calls the Church the pillar and ground of truth. But how could the Church be the ground of truth, unless they who sought were secure of obtaining truth at her hands?[5]

Divine Support

Finally, the ultimate assignable reason for the stable unity, perpetual fruitfulness on an ecumenic scale, infallibility, and indefectibility of teaching and constitution of the one Church of Christ is the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit. The Church is not a mere fortuitous aggregation of individuals, but the living Mystical Body of Christ. Pius XII observes:

> . . . if we compare a Mystical Body to a moral body, here again we must notice that the difference between them is not slight, rather

> it is very considerable and very important. In the moral body, the principle of union is nothing more than the common end, and the common cooperation of all under authority for the attainment of that end; whereas in the Mystical Body, of which we are speaking, this collaboration is supplemented by a distinct internal principle, which exists effectively in the whole and in each of its parts, and whose excellence is such, that of itself it is vastly superior to whatever bonds of union may be found in a physical or moral body. This is something, as we said above, not of the natural but of the supernatural order. Essentially it is something infinite, uncreated: the Spirit of God, who, as the Angelic Doctor says, "numerically one and the same, fills and unifies the whole Church."[6]

3. COMMUNION WITH THE SEE OF PETER

From the preceding articles, we have seen that the very nature of the Divine Plan of salvation requires that there be only one Church. Moreover, we have also noted that, by the will and intention of its Founder, this Church has enjoyed and will enjoy, a perpetual and perfect unity visible to the whole world. As a city seated upon a hill, it is easily discernible from all other claimants. The promises of Christ are infallibly efficacious—that one Church shall stand until the end of time. The will of Christ is eternally immutable as regards the nature and constitution of that one Church.

> In vain is it urged that, because of sectarianism, the "ecumenical Church of Christ . . . is left impotent, a body without organs."[7] Sectarianism originated in departure *from* the one ecumenical Church of Christ. By the fissiparous process thus initiated, the sects deteriorated and fell apart into fragments with the resulting crisis of which they rightly complain. But the one Church of Christ continued to exist and function through divinely given organs. "Children did, alas, abandon their father's house but the house did not therefore fall into ruins, supported as it was by the unceasing help of God."[8] The perfection and stability of the One Church of Christ is such, that nothing is wanting to it which is necessary for the accomplishment of its divinely given task of applying the fruits of the Redemption to the successive ages of men.

Historical Identity of the Church

Now, in order to complete the notion and to specify with definite clarity this one Church of Christ, the Catholic Ecumenist declares

that alone to be the one Church which is in communion with the See of Peter."[42] He does so with Scriptural support and historical confirmation:

> . . . that alone has ever been believed to be the Church Catholic which is united in faith and communion with the See of the Roman Pontiffs, successors of Peter; the See named . . . the root and matrix of the Catholic Church, designated by the Fathers and Councils, as its special title, the Apostolic See; the See whence sacerdotal unity took its rise; whence the laws of religious communion flow to all; wherein Peter ever lives, presides, and holds out, to all who seek the truths of faith."[43]

This is a visible token whereby the one Church may be recognized; it is a principle of identificaton through which one can easily ascertain whether or not he is conjoined to the Mystical Body of Christ. As one Anglican clergyman points out: "Valid sacraments, valid masses, true doctrine do not make a religious body Catholic if it is sundered from the See of Rome."[44] That is to say, given everything else, for want of this communion with the Holy See one is not a member of the Church of Christ; the Anglican writer is only repeating the maxim of antiquity, as St. Ambrose (333-397) put it: "*Ubi ergo Petrus, ibi ecclesia* . . ."[45] But more of this later.

Christ governs and guides the Church directly and personally, but, as Pope Pius XII indicates:

> . . . we must not think that He rules only in a hidden or extraordinary way. On the contrary, our Divine Redeemer also governs His Mystical Body in a visible way and ordinarily through His Vicar on earth . . . He was all wise; and how could He leave without a visible head the body of the Church He founded as a human society? . . . They therefore, walk the path of dangerous error who believe that they can accept Christ as the Head of the Church while they reject genuine loyalty to His Vicar on earth. They have taken away the visible head, broken the visible bonds of unity, and they leave the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in such obscurity and so maimed, that those who are seeking the haven of eternal salvation cannot see it and cannot find it."[46]

Another Anglican, a prelate of the Establishment, declares:

> We believe also that Our Lord provided a visible Head for His Church on earth in the person of St. Peter—and by implication his successors in office—when He bestowed on him the gift of the keys and that, therefore, the present occupier of the Chair of St. Peter,

> Pius XII, is his successor in office. And that belief is based on Holy Scripture and the history of the Church from the start. There, in Holy Scripture, we find Our Lord appointing what has proved to be a *necessity* for the Church on earth, a visible head. And there, in Holy Scripture, we find Him appointing Apostles, an episcopate which should, in union with the visible head, govern, carry on the affairs and preserve the unity of His Kingdom. The Primacy of the successor of St. Peter and Episcopacy, inherent in the Apostolic office, are essential, not because they have always been normal in the Christian Church, but because the Will of God has revealed them as essential in the original institution of the Church. There is no power in the Church to alter the institution of Our Lord. . . ."[47]

A prelate of the dissident Greek body wrote, "Since, therefore, the ancient Church bases its unity upon a common faith, it cannot in any way recognize the idea of an "external" unity of the Church —that is, of a unity under one person or one visible head."[48] By these words, he sets aside the teaching of the great Eastern Fathers and the explicit will of Christ. Moreover, he seems to ignore the teachings of the sacred liturgy which he employs. For example, in the Greek office for the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29) there is a long hymn, which reads in part: "Peter, Chorophaeus of the glorious Apostles, the Rock of the faith; . . . Peter, foundation of the Apostles, rock of Christ's Church, first fruit of Christians, who dost gloriously shepherd the sheep of thy fold, protect thy lambs from the treacherous wolf. . . ."[49]

In the office for the feast of Pope St. Gregory the Great (March 12) we read: "Thou, most holy Pastor, art successor to the Chair and to the zeal of the Chorophaeus, cleansing the nations and bringing them to God. . . . The first of Churches (Rome,) having drawn thee to her bosom, waters every land under the sun with the streams of her most holy teachings. . . ."[50]

What is God's Design?

Prior to any considerations as to the reunion of Christendom lies the question: What, in fact, did Christ intend when He established His Church? Pope Leo XIII remarks: "Not the foundation of the Church alone, but its whole constitution, belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's free choice. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done. We must consequently investigate not how the Church may possibly be one, but how He, who founded it, willed that it should be one."[51]

From what we have seen earlier it is evident that Christ willed His Church to be one. That this must extend to faith, government and worship is also clear from the fact that "He conferred a triple power on His Apostles and their successors, to teach, to govern, to lead men to holiness."[85]

Institution of a Teaching Body

For the unity of faith, Christ established a living Magisterium:

Besides holy writ it was absolutely necessary to insure this union of men's minds . . . that there should be another principle. This the wisdom of God requires: for He could not have willed that the faith should be one if He did not provide means sufficient for the preservation of this unity. . . . But . . . the apostolic mission was not destined to die with the apostles themselves, or come to an end in the course of time, since it was intended for the people at large and instituted for the salvation of the human race . . . Wherefore . . . Christ instituted in the Church a living, authoritative, and permanent *magisterium*, which by His own power He strengthened, by the Spirit of Truth He taught, and by miracles confirmed. He willed and ordered, under the gravest penalties, that its teachings should be received as if they were His own.[86]

Establishment of a Social Authority

In order to preserve unity of government, Christ provided a supreme authority:

Indeed, no true and perfect human society can be conceived which is not governed by some supreme authority. Christ, therefore, must have given His Church a supreme authority to which all Christians must render obedience . . . The nature of this supreme authority, which all Christians are bound to obey, can be ascertained only by finding out what was the evident and positive will of Christ. Certainly Christ is King forever; and though invisible, He continues to the end of time to govern and guard His Church from heaven. But since He willed that His kingdom should be visible He was obliged, when He ascended into heaven, to designate a vicegerent on earth.[87]

Creation of a Priestly Office

To secure the unity of divine worship and the administration of

the means of salvation, Christ created the priestly office in a divinely ordained hierarchy under one visible head:

But as this heavenly doctrine was never left to the arbitrary judgement of private individuals, but was in the beginning delivered by Jesus Christ, and afterward committed by Him exclusively to the Magisterium already named, so the power of performing and administering the divine mysteries, together with the authority of ruling and governing, was not bestowed by God on all Christians indiscriminately but on certain chosen persons. For to the Apostles and their legitimate successors alone these words have reference: "Going into the whole world preach the Gospel." "Baptizing them." "Do this in commemoration of me." "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them."[88]

Centralisation

In order to establish these facts one need not go beyond the New Testament itself, although the same truths are unanimously voiced through twenty centuries of Christian tradition. For example, St. Optatus of Milevis (ca. 370) declared:

You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal Chair was first established by Peter. In this Peter, the head of all the Apostles (hence his name Cephas), has sat; in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all, lest any of the other apostles should claim anything as exclusively his own. So much so, that he who would place another chair against that one Chair, would be a schismatic and a sinner.[89]

The prominence of Peter in the Gospels and in the Acts is beyond all question. A discerning Anglican notes that ". . . as the prominent idea in our Lord's mind is the idea of unity so the prominent person in His mind is the person of St. Peter . . ."[90]

Papal Exegeses of Petrine Texts

While it is not our intention here to introduce an extensive exposition of the Scriptural arguments for the primacy of St. Peter, which can be found elsewhere,[91] it will not be without interest to include here some illustrations of Papal exegesis of the more solemn Petrine texts.

Jesus Christ, unequivocally and explicitly, designated St. Peter as the supreme visible head of His Church, functioning as His vicegerent

on earth. Moreover, this office of Peter is an operative primacy that extends to teaching and ruling over the one Church of Christ.

In substantiation of this claim, the most noteworthy text is: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church."[5] Pope Leo XIII notes:

> From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests on its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity. How could he fulfill this office without the power of commanding, forbidding and judging, which is properly called jurisdiction? It is only by this power of jurisdiction that nations and commonwealths are held together. . . . The words—"and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—proclaim and establish the authority of which we speak. . . . The meaning of this divine utterance is, that, notwithstanding the wiles and intrigues which they bring to bear against the Church, it can never be that the Church committed to the care of Peter shall succumb or in any wise fail.[6]

Immediately after this text, we read: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[7]

> . . . . He is still clearly speaking of the Church, which a short time before He had called His own, and which He declared He wished to build on Peter as on a foundation. The Church is typified not only as an edifice but as a kingdom, and everyone knows that the keys constitute the usual sign of governing authority. Wherefore when Christ promised to give to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He promised to give him the power and authority over the Church. . . . This metaphorical expression of binding and loosing indicates the power of making laws, of judging and punishing; and the power is said to be of such amplitude and force that God would ratify whatever is decreed by it. Thus it is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church.[8]

Later, after His Resurrection, Christ said to Peter: "Feed my lambs . . . feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep."[9]

> These, then, are the duties of a shepherd: to place himself as leader at the head of his flock, to provide proper food for it, to ward off dangers, to guard against insidious foes, to defend it against violence: in a word, to rule and govern it. Since therefore Peter has been placed as shepherd of the Christian flock he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed His blood.[10]

Certainly, a confirmation of this teaching may be found in the words of Our Lord to Peter, just before His Passion: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you (plural,) that he might sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren."[11]

> And since all Christians must be closely united in the communion of the one immutable faith, Christ the Lord, in virtue of His prayers, obtained for Peter that in the fulfillment of his office he should never fall away from the faith. "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail," and He furthermore commanded him to impart light and strength to his brethren as often as the need should arise: "Strengthen thy brethren." He willed then that he whom He had designated as foundation of the Church should be the defence of its faith.[12]

Convergence of the Bonds of Unity

> . . From these considerations we can see, as Pius IX notes, "No one can deny or doubt that Jesus Christ . . . built His only Church in this world on Peter . . ." Moreover, from the immutability of the will of Christ, it is evident that "this Church, which is His Mystical Body, might always in its nature remain firm and immovable to the consummation of ages . . ."[13] Summing up the argument thus given, we quote from the Holy Office:
>
> . . . . Christ Jesus, in order to produce and ever preserve unity in His Church, and through the appointment of a head to remove the occasion of schism, has, by a special providence, chosen the most blessed Peter in preference to the other apostles, to be their Prince, and the conspicuous center and bond of that unity. On him He has built His Church; to him He has given a supreme charge and authority to feed the entire flock, to confirm his brethren, to bind and loose throughout the world. This is a Catholic dogma, coming from the lips of Christ, delivered and maintained by the perpetual teaching of the Fathers, religiously preserved by the uni-

versal Church through every age, and often confirmed against the errors of innovators, by decrees of supreme Pontiffs and Councils."

Participation of Jurisdiction

While the declaration that the Church in communion with the Holy See is the one Church of Christ is sufficient of itself, it would give an incomplete picture of the divinely given order of the Church. Because, in addition to Peter and under him, the other Apostles were given charge over the flock of Christ:

But if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also chose twelve, whom He called Apostles; and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked upon as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule."

Continuity of Succession

The Apostles shared with Peter, and under him, the office of teaching, ruling and sanctifying the members of the Church. So, too, the bishops who were successors of the Apostles:

For the Apostles consecrated bishops, and each one appointed those who were to succeed them immediately "in the ministry of the word." Nay more: they likewise required their successors to choose fitting men, to endow them with like authority, and to confide to them the office and mission of teaching. . . . Wherefore, as Christ was sent by God and the apostles by Christ, so the bishops and those who succeeded them were sent by the apostles."

Moreover, it is only in virtue of their conjunction with the See of Peter that the bishops possess this authority. By the will of Christ, as expressed in the words, "Feed my lambs . . . feed my lambs . . . feed my sheep," St. Peter was to possess jurisdiction over the whole flock taken both distributively and collectively.

. . . as far as each one's diocese is concerned, they each and all as true shepherds feed the flocks entrusted to them and rule them in the name of Christ. Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are duly subordinate to the authority of the Roman Pontiff; and although their jurisdiction is inherent in their office, yet they receive it directly from the same Roman Pontiff. . . ."

Above all things the need of union between the bishops and the successors of Peter is clear and undeniable. This bond once broken, Christians would be separated and scattered, and in no wise form one body and one flock. . . . But the Episcopal order is rightly judged to be in communion with Peter, as Christ commanded, if it be subject to and obeys Peter . . . If the power of binding and loosing and feeding confers upon each and every one of the bishops, the successors of the apostles, a real authority to rule the people committed to him, certainly, the same power must have the same effect in his case to whom the duty of feeding the lambs, and sheep has been assigned by God. . . . Surely jurisdiction and authority belong to him in whose power have been placed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, not alone in all provinces taken singly, but in all taken collectively."

Return to Historical Christianity

To conclude this chapter, it should be evident that the proper and the only goal of the reunion of Christendom is communion with the See of Peter on the part of those who do not as yet enjoy it. There can be no other goal, because historical Christianity is identical with the visible continuity of that Church whose foundation was laid by Christ Himself and which He promised to support until the consummation of the world.

Seeing then . . . that the Catholic Church has been shown to be one, and incapable of partition and division, we would have you hesitate no longer to take refuge in the bosom of that Church, which, by the acknowledgement of all mankind, holds the supreme authority by the succession of its bishops from the Apostolic See . . ."
Let these separated children return to the Apostolic See established in this city which the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, consecrated with their blood . . . not indeed with the idea or hope that "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth" will abandon the integrity of the faith and bear their errors, but to subject themselves to its teaching authority and rule. . . ."

NOTES

[1] Holy office, *Quod vos*: "Catholica enim ecclesia alia esse non potest praeter eam, quae supra unum Petrum aedificata, in unum connexum atque compactum unitate fidei et caritatis assurgit." Prop. II of official summary. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* II, 668.

[2] "As there is but one Church of Jesus Christ, that Church cannot undertake its full task nor fulfill its true destiny unless unity marks the relations between the members." (we accept the first clause; the idea contained in the rest of the sentence will be discussed later). John A. Mackay "The Ecumenical goal" O. F. Noble, *Towards World-Wide Christianity* (New York: Harpers, 1946) p. 41.

[3] Angus Dun, *Prospecting for a United Church* (New York: Harpers, 1948) pp. 8, 9.

[4] W.A. Visser't Hooft, "The significance of the World Council of Churches," *Man's Disorder and God's design* (New York: Harpers, 1948) I, 186.

[5] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XX, 8; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity* (Washington: N.C.W.C., 1928) p. 5.

[6] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, Epistolae, Constitutiones* (Paris: Desclee De Brouwer, 1900) VI, 161; Eng. tr.: *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903) p. 350.

[7] Leo XIII, *ibid.* VI, 157 Eng. tr., p. 351.

[8] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 8; Eng. tr., p. 6.

[9] John 20:21.

[10] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., pp. 352-353.

[11] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 158-159; Eng. tr., p. 358.

[12] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 9; Eng. tr., p. 6.

[13] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., p. 358.

[14] J. A. F. Gregg, "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church" *Man's disorder and God's design*, *op. cit.*, I, 60-61.

[15] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163; Eng. tr., p. 359.

[16] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 160, Eng. tr., pp. 354-355.

[17] Holy Office, *Quod vos*: "Eiusmodi connexum compactumque corpus ingiter esse et proprietatem verae Christi Domini Ecclesiae, et splendidissimam notam, qua ipsa Ecclesia ab omnibus sectis tuto ac facile distinguatur." Proposition III of official summary. ASS, II, 669.

[18] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 173, 174; Eng. tr., p. 371.

[19] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II 663; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867), p. 237.

[20] Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London: Longmans, Green, 1912) p. 4.

[21] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 8; Eng. tr., p. 5.

[22] 1 Cor. 12:27.

[23] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 158, 159; Eng. tr., pp. 352-353.

[24] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 226-227; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 31.

[25] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis: Allocutiones*, V, 276; Eng. tr., p. 308.

[26] Charles Clayton Morrison, *Can Protestantism win America?* (New York: Harpers, 1948) pp. 179, 182.

[27] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 163-164; Eng. tr., p. 359.

[28] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 13-14; Eng. tr., p. 5.

[29] J. L. Shaver, *The polity of Churches* (Chicago: Church Polity Press, 1947) I, 66-67.

[30] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis: Allocutiones*, V, 279; Eng. tr., p. 312.

[31] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 173; Eng. tr., pp. 370-371.

[32] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 159; Eng. tr., p. 353.

[33] C. D. Boardman "The Doctrine of the Church," A. H. Bradford (ed.) *Christ in the Church* (New York: Revell, 1895) p. 151.

[34] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 162; Eng.tr., p. 357.

[35] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 223-224; Eng. tr., p. 29.

[36] Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, AAS, XXXIX, 522, 528; Eng. tr.: *The Sacred Liturgy* (Washington: N.C.W.C, 1948) pp. 4, 9-10.

[37] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum: Allocutiones*, VI, 172; Eng. tr., p. 370.

[38] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 663-664; Eng.tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, pp. 238-240.

[39] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 222; Eng. tr., p. 28.

[40] C. C. Morrison, *Can Protestantism Win America?* *op. cit.*, p. 171.

[41] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 15; Eng. tr., p. 16.

[42] Holy Office, *Quod vos*: "Quamlibet itaque unitatem, quae vim suam non mutuetur a Petro in suis successoribus iugiter vivente, quaeque in fidei unitate et caritatis seu communionis non assurgat, ludibrium potius catholicae unitatis, quam unitatem fore appellandum." Proposition IV of official summary, ASS, II, 669.

[43] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 665; Eng. tr.: Manning: *op. cit.*, pp. 241-242.

[44] Father Clement (James Tait Plowden-Wardlaw) *Catholic reunion; an Anglican plea* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1935) p. 4.

[45] St. Ambrose, *Enarationes in 12 psalmos davidicos*, 40, 30; *Patrologia Latina* (Paris: Migne, 1882) 14, 1082.

[46] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 209-211; Eng. tr., p. 18-19.

[47] Vibert Jackson, "Three matters of importance," *The Pilot*, V. 5, no. 1 (Spring 1951) pp. 11-12.

[48] Archbishop Germanos, "The Eastern Orthodox Church," James Marchant (ed.) *The Reunion of Christendom* (New York: Henry Holt, 1929) p. 32.

[49] Quoted in: T. Livius, *S. Peter, Bishop of Rome*, (London: Burns & Oates, 1888) pp. 364, 367. We would add another from the Greek office for the feast of St. Peter's Chain: "Thou, who art at once the foundation, base and summit of the Apostles, . . . And thou didst become, too, of Rome first Bishop; of her, the orthodox among the cities, foundation-base and column; of Christ's Church the solidity; and the gates of hell shall verily never move her, as Christ hath declared . . ." *ibid.* p. 350 For further evidence see the Anglican translation: John B. Wainewright, *The Office for the commemoration of . . . Peter and Paul . . . according to the Byzantine Rite* (London: Cope & Fenwick, 1909) the whole work.

[49] Livius, *St. Peter*, *op. cit.*, p. 380.
[50] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 160; Eng. tr., pp. 354-355.
[51] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, *AAS*, XXXV, 209; Eng. tr., p. 18.
[52] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 164, 166, 170; Eng. tr., pp. 360, 363, 367.
[53] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 174; Eng. tr., pp. 371-372.
[54] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 172; Eng. tr., p. 370.
[55] St. Optatus Milevitanus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2,2: "Negare non potes scire te in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse collatum, in qua sederit omnium Apostolorum caput Petrus, unde et Cephas est appellatus, in qua una cathedra unitas ab omnibus servaretur, ne ceteri apostoli singulas sibi quisque defenderent, ut iam schismaticus et peccator esset qui contra singularem cathedram alteram collocaret." *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna: 1893) 26, 36.
[56] Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See* (London: Longmans, 1902) p. 90. The whole chapter III (pp. 85-174) is of interest in this connection.
[57] A useful work in English is: Thomas W. Allies, *St. Peter; his name and office* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1923.)
[58] Matt. 16:18.
[59] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 175-176; Eng.tr., p. 374.
[60] Matt. 16:19.
[61] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 176-177; Eng. tr., p. 375.
[62] John 21:15-17.
[63] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 177; Eng. tr., p. 376.
[64] Luke 22:31-32.
[65] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 177-178; Eng. tr., p. 376.
[66] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes*, *Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) Col 8; Eng. tr.: David Lewis (ed.) *The year of preparation for the Vatican Council* (London: Burns, Oates, 1869) p. 53-54.
[67] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, *AAS*, II, 664-665; Eng. tr.: Manning: *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 241.
[68] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, VI, 182; Eng. tr., pp 381-382.
[69] Leo XIII, *ibid.*, VI, 167; Eng. tr., p. 363.
[70] Pius XII, *Mystici cororis*, *AAS*, XXXV, 211-212; Eng. tr., p. 19.
[71] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: *Allocutiones*, 182, 184, 186; Eng. tr., pp. 382, 384-385, 386.
[72] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, *ASS*, II, 667; Eng. tr.: Manning, *op. cit.*, p. 246.
[73] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, *AAS*, XX, 15-16; Eng. tr., pp. 16-17.

CHAPTER TWO

The Point of Departure

I. THE FACT OF SEPARATION

Having established the goal of reunion of Christendom as communion with the Holy See, it is necessary now to determine the starting point. What is the status of the parties concerned? This is variously answered in the literature of non-Catholic Ecumenism. In most cases the answer is rather left to be inferred than clearly stated. The general principle of such inference is: as one conceives the Church, so one conceives reunion.

Non-Catholic Conception of the Status of Parties

Whether one traces the answer through the Evangelical tradition of the invisible Church or the Episcopal notion of the visible Church, the answer seems to be about the same: all Christians are, more or less, members of the one Church of Christ. The movement towards reunion seems to be an attempt to remove defects in the outward conditions of such membership. As an instance of this idea, which is quite common, can be found in the following:

> First of all, Church unity should be distinguished from Christian unity or the oneness of believers in Christ. . . . This one invisible Church, as it is often called, persists in and through all visible churches and denominations, survives their mutations and destructions, and remains intact even amid their conflicts and schisms. . . . That we are all one in Christ is an admitted fact from which we proceed, and the common ground upon which we stand.[1]

There is no historical or scriptural justification for that statement; indeed, it is contrary to common sense. How could they be members of the one Church, who in no manner agree in faith, worship or government and form distinct societies over against one another?

The notion of a "divided Church" is one that, "overthrows the divine constitution of the Church."[2] Pius XI wrote: ". . . they understand by a visible Church nothing but a society formed by various Christian communities even though these adhere to different and even mutually contradictory doctrines."[3]

But when we consider what was actually done we find that Jesus Christ did not, in point of fact, institute a Church to embrace several communities similar in nature, but in themselves distinct, and lacking those bonds which render the Church unique and indivisible after that manner in which in the symbol of our faith we profess: "I believe in one Church."[4]

Much of the present confusion on the subject had its origin in a subterfuge of the Reformers.[5]

The Fact: Separation From The Church

All the religious bodies composed of baptized persons which are not in communion with the Holy See at the present time can be traced historically to some point in time where a breach was made *from* the one Church of Christ. As Pope Leo XIII notes: "Before the day when man separated what God had joined together, the name of the Apostolic See was held in reverence by all the nations of the Christian world; and the East, like the West, agreed without hesitation in its obedience to the Roman Pontiff, as the legitimate successor of St. Peter, and therefore, the Vicar of Christ here on earth."[6]

To the Oriental Dissidents, Pope Pius IX wrote:

> . . . we turn our eyes and paternal mind to those churches which were formerly united in the bond of unity with this Apostolic See, and flourished with so great renown of holiness and of heavenly doctrine, producing rich fruits for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. These churches are now, to our extreme grief . . . separated and divided from the communion of the Holy Roman Church which is spread throughout the world.[7]

To the Anglicans, the Holy Office wrote:

> And this. . . Pope Pius IX . . . earnestly beseeches from the God of mercies and Father of lights that all of you at length escaping from your severed, disinherited condition into the inheritance of Christ, the true Catholic Church, to which your forefathers belonged before

the deplorable separation of the sixteenth century, may happily attain the root of charity in the bond of peace and fellowship of unity."

To all Protestants, Pius IX wrote:

Now whoever will carefully examine and reflect upon the condition of the various religious societies which are divided amongst themselves, and separated from the Catholic Church, which from the days of Our Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles has ever exercised, by its lawful pastors and still does exercise, the divine power committed to it by the same Lord, will easily satisfy himself that none of these societies, either singly or together, in any way form, or are, that one Catholic Church which our Lord founded and built, and which He chose should be in the world: and that he cannot by any means say that these societies are members or parts of that Church, since they are visibly separated from Catholic unity."

In the citations just given, the terminology used is especially significant. Those who are not in communion with the Holy See are said to be in a "severed and disinherited condition." Moreover, in no sense of the word can they be said to be members or parts of the one Church, since "they are visibly separated from Catholic unity." Furthermore, none of these separated religious societies, "either singly or together, in any way form, or are, that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded and built." Of noteworthy interest in this connection are the words of W. A. Visser't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches:

This is the dilemma which dominates the whole existence of the Council. Its member churches are as yet unable to *be* together the one Church of God, but they are no longer able to regard their fellow members as being outside the Church of God . . . The World Council *is* not the *Una Sancta*, but a means and a method which have no other *raison d'etre* than to be used for the building of the *Una Sancta*."

The statement that the "member churches are as yet unable to *be* together the one Church of God" corresponds almost verbally to the words of Pope Pius IX. On the other hand, no one of them, singly taken, is "that one Church which Our Lord founded and built," because every one of them has directly or indirectly withdrawn at specific points of history from the visible communion of that same Catholic Church. Therefore, the *Una Sancta* which is to be fashioned out of these disparate elements, no one of which is of divine origin,

cannot, in any historical or scriptural sense, be that one Catholic Church which Our Lord founded. Pius XI declared: "Necessarily, therefore, the Church of Christ ought not only to exist today and always, but still more, be the same as it was in the Apostolic ages, unless we should wish to utter the absurdity that Christ Our Lord either was not adequate to His purpose or had erred when He asserted that, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."" The Holy Office noted:

If, then, it be a mark of Christ's Church, special and perpetual, that with perfect unity of faith and charity of communion, it coheres, flourishes, and, as a city set on a hill, is manifest to all men in all times; if, again, Christ has willed that of such unity the Apostolic See of Peter should be the source, center, and bond, it follows that no congregation whatsoever, separated from the external visible communion and obedience of the Roman Pontiff, can be the Church of Christ, or can in any way whatsoever belong to the Church of Christ."

The Line of Cleavage

The historical and visible continuity of the one Church of Christ provides an easy basis for the reunion of Christendom. The cleavage and therefore the distinction between this Church and all others is unequivocally clear in the Papal documents. The starting point, then, of reunion is from non-membership to membership in the one Church of Christ.

This clear distinction between members and non-members of the Church of Christ has been somewhat confused by some Catholic authors to the detriment of true reunion; they have rather unwittingly served to encourage delusions in the minds of non-Catholic ecumenists. For example, Fr. Victor White, writing in *Blackfriars* for September 1941 remarks: "There is something wrong with the facile assumption that the distinction of Catholics from non-Catholics, of members of the Church from non-members of the Church, is always a manifest one . . . Certainly the Church is visible, and visible by reason of the visibility of her members and her organization. But the edges are very blurred."

The Anglican writer who quotes these words, infers:

An admission of this kind is not only significant as proceeding from such a source, but has an important bearing on the whole modern problem of Christian reunion, since those who accept such a view

cannot well approach its problems in a wholly exclusive spirit. The obvious inference appears to be that it is impossible to give any clear-cut answer to the question, "Who are members of the Church?"[14]

A similar line of thought can be found in the following statement of Fr. M.J. Congar: "We cannot say that any dissident Christian body whatever is a member of the *Una Ecclesia*. Nevertheless, it would seem to the present writer that the various dissident Christian bodies, each in a very varying degree, may be regarded in some fashion as *elements* of the Church."[15]

There is no justification to be found in Papal documents for these declarations of the Catholic writers or for the inference of the Anglican writer. The evidence as to what constitutes a person as a member of the Church is unequivocal and definite. If one examines the citations given, he would have no doubt of that fact.

Membership in The Church

The most recent indication as to what constitutes a member of the one Church of Christ can be found in the following from Pope Pius XII:

> Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority. . . . It follows that those who are divided in faith and government cannot be living in one Body such as this, and cannot be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.[16]

Later, in the same document, the Pontiff points out that these tokens of membership are integrally involved in the nature of the Church itself:

> Now since this social Body of Christ has been designed by its Founder to be visible, this cooperation of its members must also be externally manifest through their profession of the same faith, and their sharing in the same sacred rites, through participation in the same sacrifice and practical observance of the same laws. And furthermore, it is absolutely necessary that the supreme Head be visible to the eyes of all, that Head from whom the mutually cooperative works of all towards the attainment of the proposed end is given effective direction: the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth.[17]

It is abundantly clear, then, that those only are members of the one Church who are baptized and are visibly conjoined together in one historical society, professing one and the same faith, participating in the same sacraments, under one visible head, the successor of St. Peter. The most obvious token of membership is communion with the See of Peter: "No one is found in the one Church of Christ and no one perseveres in it unless he acknowledges and accepts obediently the supreme authority of St. Peter and his legitimate successors."[18] Accordingly, "The fact that a man is not united to that Rock on which Catholic unity is based, is of itself sufficient proof that he is not in the Catholic Church."[19] Consequently, the starting point of the reunion of Christendom is non-membership in the Church, looking towards membership as to a goal.

2. *IMPLICATIONS OF SEPARATION*

We have noted that religious bodies of Christian name which are out of communion with the Holy See are, by that very fact, separated from the one Church of Christ and from the promises made to that Church. This condition of separation involves many disadvantages which make the pursuit of reunion imperative. From their own point of view non-Catholic ecumenists are aware of the fact that their present condition leaves much to be desired:

> We are seeing today the practical evils and the spiritual loss of our divisions, but this is not all that we need to realize. Our divisions are contrary to the mind of Christ. Our disunion is not only a waste and a loss, it is a sin, and it is a sin in which we are all involved. It is Christ's will that is being thwarted, it is Christ's work that is being hindered, it is Christ's truth and power that is being hidden from the world by the separations and divisions among Christians.[20]

Of course, it should be noted that this condition which the Episcopalian writer describes finds its origin and logical consequence in separation *from* the Church and not division *of* the Church. The promises of Christ have not been frustrated insofar as *His* Church is concerned.

Lack of Ecumenical Mission and Authority

As religious organizations, these separated bodies are completely wanting in the formal and perpetual ecumenical mission which

Christ gave to His Church: "All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world."

To no one of these bodies, nor to all of them taken together were those words addressed, but only to the Society of the Apostles with St. Peter at their head. In leaving the Church, these separated bodies have no longer any part in the mission and authority given by Christ to the Church. Pius IX said:

> For such societies, being destitute of that living authority established by God, which especially teaches men the things of faith and the rule of morals, and which guides them in everything that relates to eternal life, are always varying in their doctrines; and this change and instability are increasing. Everyone can easily understand, and clearly and evidently see that this is distinctly opposite to the Church instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, in which truth must always continue firm and inaccessible to change, as a deposit given to the Church to be guarded in its integrity, and for the guardianship of which the presence and aid of the Holy Ghost have been promised to her forever. Everyone also knows that from these divergent doctrines and opinions, social schisms had their birth, and that these again have generated sects and communions without number, which are continually spreading, to the great injury of Christian and civil society."

As Separately Taken

The words of the Pontiff are, curiously enough, confirmed by admissions of leaders of some of these separated bodies.

An Eastern Dissident writer says: "The members of the Orthodox Church are left a great deal of freedom in regard to the hues and shades of their theological opinions . . . There are no authoritative decisions or definitions issuing from the Church in respect to many important questions."

An Anglican prelate, referring to the Lambeth conferences in which all the prelates of that communion convene together periodically, declares:

> The conferences themselves are not authoritative. They have no power to pass canons or to bind rules and regulations upon any part of the Church. . . . It will be found for instance that characteristic

> differences of theological color cut across national boundaries . . . Whatever names they go by, high, low, or broad churchmen can be found practically everywhere."

A Congregationalist declares:

> Congregationalists have no permanently written standards, no finally authoritative documents. Such a lack might seem to render it impossible to state with precision what they do or do not stand for. Nevertheless their ethos is well-enshrined in their history and church life; . . . Congregationalism has thus shown itself to be no fixed deposit, but an abiding spirit of free growth, capable of indefinite development, such as ever reaches out to new truth and yet retains undiminished its central Christian loyalty."

The statements which have been adduced above give overwhelming evidence that no one of these bodies has any authority to teach in the name of Christ; indeed, they appear to make no claims in that regard. Yet surely such a commission was given to the one Church of Christ, as the Scriptures attest. The denominational divisions of Christendom have been correctly expressed as a "tragedy." The tragedy becomes more intense when one looks at each body by itself—in most of them the only point of unity is a vague common tradition beneath the tensions of fundamentalism-modernism, high-low churchism, neo-orthodox-liberalism."

As Collectively Gathered

Now, when all these bodies convene in Council, do they possess any more authority collectively than they did individually? They do not; as a matter of fact they admit it. For example, the opening words of the Constitution of the World Council of Churches reads as follows: "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour." Those words would seem to be clear and definite in the traditional Christological connotation. However, this is not necessarily so, for the provisional committee which prepared the constitution stated:

> As its brevity shows, the basis is an affirmation of the Christian faith of the participating churches, and not a credal test to judge churches or persons. It is an affirmation of the Incarnation and the Atonement. The Council desires to be a fellowship of those churches which accept these truths. But it does not concern itself with the manner in which the churches interpret them. It will therefore be the re-

sponsibility of each particular church to decide whether it can collaborate on this basis."

In view of the fact that, "the contemporary religious mind has been beset by a Christological agnosticism,"[5] it would be difficult to ascertain what is precisely intended by the expression, "God and Saviour." Indeed, as the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches points out:

> The World Council must, therefore, not pretend that it represents the *Una Sancta*. . . As an institution, it has no authority, not even as much authority as its member churches, . . . It has nothing but its basis, which is interpreted in different ways. It has no common spiritual language. The meaning of witness and confession is understood differently by different churches. And while they are all at one in recognizing the authority of Holy Scripture, there are deep divergences between them as to the actual significance of that authority for the life of the Church. Dare the World Council speak as long as it has to stand on so uncertain a foundation?[6]

It is doomed to perpetual silence, for, to one Church alone was that teaching authority given—that same Church from which they have separated themselves.

Lack of Jurisdiction

Not only do these bodies have no authority to teach, but they also lack effective spiritual jurisdiction to rule in the name of Christ. This refers to all of them, not even excepting those bodies possessed of a succession of valid Orders. Pope Leo XIII said:

> From this it must be clearly understood that bishops are deprived of the right and power of ruling, if they deliberately secede from Peter and his successors; because, by this secession, they are separated from the foundation on which the whole edifice must rest. They are therefore outside the *edifice* itself; and for this very reason they are separated from the *fold*, whose leader is the Chief Pastor; they are exiled from the *kingdom*, the keys of which were given by Christ to Peter alone."

Difficulty as Regards Salvation

Another distinct disadvantage, and an overwhelming one, under which those separated from the Holy See labor is the difficulty as

regards their eternal salvation. This consideration should provoke an earnest and sincere examination of the security of their present state and compel them to seek out means for immediate reunion with the Holy See. The basic principle is set forth by Leo XIII:

> The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same forever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord—leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition. . . . And with the same yearning Our soul goes out to those whom the foul breath of irreligion has not entirely corrupted, and who at least seek to have the true God, the Creator of heaven and earth, as their Father. Let such as these take counsel with themselves, and realize that they can in no wise be counted among the children of God, unless they take Christ Jesus as their Brother, and at the same time the Church as their Mother."

The first passage refers to those who have knowingly abandoned the one Church of Christ: To depart from the Church is to depart from Christ and to renounce the promised rewards of Christ. The second passage refers to those who, through no fault of their own are outside the Church: They are urged to consider the peril of their present state, and, with the aid of divine grace, to come to the realization that if they would have God as their Father, they must have Christ for their Brother—this last is not realized unless they have the one Church for their Mother. The Holy Office wrote: "To that end, the Catholic Church offers prayers to Almighty God, and urges the faithful in Christ to pray, that all who have left the Holy Roman Church, out of which there is no salvation, may abjure their errors and be brought to the true faith, and the peace of that Church; . . ."[8]

"Outside The Church No Salvation"

Since the intrinsic relationship between connection with the Church and eternal salvation is the primary motivation which the Popes urge in connection with the reunion of Christendom, it will be useful to note here, briefly, the axiom, *Extra Ecclesia nulla salus*. This axiom was not called into question, but was rather emphatically affirmed by some of the Protestant confessions at the time of the Reformation. Of course the axiom was made inapplicable by shifting the connotation of *Ecclesia* to an invisible realm consisting of the "just" or the "predestined," according as one followed the Lutheran or Calvinist persuasion. But, in the sixteen centuries of Chris-

tian tradition that preceded them, there was no doubt in anyone's mind as to the precise designation of the term, *Ecclesia*. For example, the Waldensians returning to unity in 1208 were required to include the following statement in their profession of faith: "We believe with our heart and confess with our mouth that there is one Church, not of the heretics, but the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic, outside of which we believe no one is saved."[5] Pope Pius IX wrote:

> It must be held as of faith, that outside the Apostolic Roman Church no one can be saved, that this is the only ark of salvation, that those who shall not have entered it shall perish in the flood; . . .[6] . . . But it is a most noteworthy Catholic dogma that no one outside the Catholic Church can be saved, and those contumacious against the authority of the same Church, its definitions, and pertinaciously divided from the unity of this Church and from the Roman Pontiff the successor of Peter, to whom the care of the vine was committed by the Saviour, cannot obtain eternal salvation.[7]

By these words, it can be clearly seen that there is an intrinsic relationship between connection with the Church and eternal salvation. This relationship was set up by Christ Himself, when He said, for instance, "Who heareth you heareth me, and who despises you despises me:"[8] "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."[9] The voice of Christian tradition is in accord with this truth.

Necessary Qualifications of The Axiom

The words of the Pontiff have been quoted out of context in order to bring out the basic doctrine. However, if left in their present form without further explanation, the words would likely engender misunderstanding. The first qualification to note is that connection with the one Church is an essential means of salvation, but that those who are invincibly ignorant of the fact are guilty of no sin, as regards this point, in the eyes of God. Pius IX adds:

> . . . but nevertheless, it must likewise be held for certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if it be invincible, are bound by no fault for this thing before the eyes of God. Now who is there who would assume to himself so great a task that he could designate limits to this ignorance according to the variety and background of peoples, regions, abilities, and so many other things? But when we are separated from these bodily chains, we shall see God as He is, we shall perchance understand how the divine mercy

> and justice are linked by a beautiful bond; but as long as we are on earth, weighed down with this mass which enfeebles the soul, let us most firmly hold from Catholic teaching that there is *one God, one Faith, one baptism*; it is not right to push inquiry further.[10]

The next qualification to note is that, in order to be saved, a person must in fact (*in re*) be visibly conjoined to the Church *i.e.* be a member, or, he must, at least intend (*in voto*) to become a member of the Church. This intention to become a member of the Church may be *explicit* or *implicit*. The intention is *explicit* when a person is actually under instruction preparing to enter Catholic unity. On the other hand, the intention is *implicit* if a person, while invincibly ignorant of the Church, possesses sanctifying grace. The fact that he is in the state of grace indicates that he has a sincere will of using *all* the means which God has established; even though he does not know explicitly single means, he implicitly receives all. This person is then unknowingly participating in the life of the Church—he is saved through the Church.[11] Pius IX indicates what may well be considered an implicit intention of entering the Church:

> . . . It is known to us and to you that those who labor in invincible ignorance regarding our most holy religion, and who, carefully keeping the natural law and its precepts engraved in the hearts of all by God, and are prepared to obey God, live an upright life, can, by the power of divine light and grace operating, attain eternal life, since God, who beholds, searches and knows the minds, souls, thoughts, habits of all, according to His most high goodness and clemency will not at all permit anyone to be punished by eternal torments, whom He does not regard as guilty of voluntary sin . . .[12]

However, the position of such a person is not completely secure, because, once his initial ignorance is no longer invincible and his conscience, under grace, moves him to enter the Church, or, at least, study its claims, then the issue is formally presented to him. If he refuses to examine further or does not seek to enter the Church, his implicit intention is dissolved, because he has withdrawn himself from the sincere will of using *all* the means which God wills; his condition is changed because his will toward God is changed.[13] If he perseveres in this condition, he cannot be saved.

Strong Motivation For Seeking Unity

It should be sufficiently clear that separation from the one Church

of Christ involves serious disadvantages, notably, of course, is the difficulty as regards eternal salvation. For this reason, the Popes have urged a sincere and earnest consideration of the security of their position on the part of those separated from the fold. Pius IX urged all of these . . .

> . . . to consider and seriously examine whether they follow the path marked out for them by Jesus Christ Our Lord, which leads to eternal salvation. . . . Let all those who do not profess the unity and truth of the Catholic Church . . . satisfy the longings of their hearts, and liberate themselves from that state in which they cannot be assured of their own salvation. Let them unceasingly offer fervent prayers to the God of mercy, that He will throw down the wall of separation, that He will lead them back to the bosom of our Holy Mother the Church, in whom their fathers found the salutary pastures of life, in whom alone the whole doctrine of Jesus Christ is preserved and handed down and the mysteries of heavenly grace dispensed.[36]

Using almost the same words, Pope Pius XII adds the notion which we have discussed above relative to those linked to the Church by implicit intention (*in voto*):

> From a heart overflowing with love we ask each and everyone of them to be quick and ready to follow the interior movements of grace, and to look to withdrawing from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though unsuspectingly they may be ordained toward the Mystical Body of the Redeemer in desire and resolution (*inscio quodam desiderio ac voto . . . ordinentur*), they still remain deprived of so many precious gifts and helps from Heaven, which one can enjoy only in the Catholic Church . . .[37]

These considerations should move ecumenically-minded Protestants to seek the way to reunion of Christendom in accordance with the Divine Plan, prompted likewise by the right motive—eternal salvation

NOTES

[1] C. W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895) p. 67.

[2] Holy Office, *Apostolici Sedli, Acta Sanctae Sedis*, II, 658; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867) p. 229.

[3] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XX, 8; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity* (Washington, D.C.: N.C.W.C., 1928) p. 5.

[4] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones Epistolae, Constitutiones* (Paris: Desclee, 1900) VI, 160; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903) p. 355.

[5] "In fact, the Reformed seemed generally to have taught the doctrine of the visibility of the Church, until some of them deemed it necessary, in consequence of their controversy with the Romanists, who asked them where their Church existed before Luther, to maintain that the Church might sometimes be invisible." William Palmer, *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (New York: Appleton, 1841), I, 26.

[6] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Allocutiones* V, 275; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical letters*, op. cit., p. 307.

[7] Pius IX, *Arcano Divinae Providentiae, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburg Brisgoviae,: Herder, 1892) Col. 7; Eng. tr.: David Lewis, (ed.) *The year of preparation for the Vatican Council* (London: Burns, Oates, 1869) pp. 46-47.

[8] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS, II, 668; Eng. tr.: Manning, op. cit., pp. 246-247.

[9] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta . . . concilii Vaticani*, Col. 9; Eng. tr.: p. 54.

[10] World Council of Churches, *Man's disorder and God's design* (New York: Harpers, 1948) I, 186-187.

[11] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 9; Eng. tr.: p. 6.

[12] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS. II, 666; Eng. tr.: Manning, op. cit., pp. 243-244.

[13] T .G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (London: S.P.C.K., 1944) p. 457.

[14] M. J. Congar, *Divided Christendom Tr. M. A. Bousfield* (London: Goeffrey Bles, 1939), p. 242.

[15] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS, XXXV, 202-203; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 12.

[16] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS. XXXV, 227: "Quoniam vero, ut supra diximus, sociale eiusmodi Christi Corpus ex Conditoris sui voluntate adspectabile esse debet, conspiratio illa membrorum omnium extrinsecus etiam esse manifestet opus, est, cum per eiusdem fidei professionem, tum per eorundem communionem sacrorum, per eiusdemque participationem sacrificii, tum denique per actuosam earundem legum observantiam. Idque praeterea omnino necessarium est, ut in oculis omnium conspicuum adsit supremum Caput, a quo mutua invicem adjutrix omnium opera ad propositum assequendam finem efficienter dirigatur: Jesu Christi dictmus in terris Vicarium."

[17] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS, XX, 15; Eng. tr.: p. 15.

[18] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS II, 665: "Quo uno satis ostendit, in Ecclesia Catholica eum non esse qui non inhaereat illae Petrae, in qua fundamentum positum est unitatis catholicae."

[19] William T. Manning in: Kenneth Mackenzie ed., *Union of Christendom* (London: Religious Book Club, 1938) I, 18-19.

[20] Matt. 28:18-20.

[21] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae concilii Vaticani*, Col. 8; Eng. tr.: pp. 54-55.

[22] Nicholas Arseniev in: Mackenzie (ed.) *Union of Christendom*, op. cit., II, 381.

[7] J. W. C. Wand, *The Anglican Communion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948) pp. x,xiii.

[8] C.J. Cadoux, in: Kenneth Mackenzie ed., *Union of Christendom*, *op. cit.*, II, 503-504.

[9] "But the tragedy of denominationalism is that it has belied, and prevented the full development of, the ecumenical spirit which is basic in the Gospel. Denominationalism springs primarily from the principle of freedom of choice and the right of private interpretation, inherent in the Protestant Reformation." W. Stanley Rycroft in: O. Frederick Nolde ed., *Toward World-Wide Christianity* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946) p. 205.

[10] *ibid.* p. 210.

[11] World Council of Churches, *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949) p. 197.

[12] World Council of Churches, *The World Council of Churches: its process of formation* (Geneva: World Council, 1946) p. 182.

[13] Carl F. H. Henry, *The Protestant Dilemma* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) p. 164.

[14] W.A. Visser't Hooft in: *Man's disorder and God's design*, *op. cit.*, I, 187, 189.

[15] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*, *Allocutiones* VI. 183; Eng. tr.: p. 383.

[16] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*, *Allocutiones* VI. 183, 189; Eng. tr.: pp. 358, 390.

[17] Holy Office, *ASS* II, 659: Eng. tr.: Manning, *op. cit.*, pp. 229, 230.

[18] " . . . Corde credimus et ore confitemur unam Ecclesiam non haereticorum, sed sanctam Romanam, Catholicam et apostolicam, extra quam neminem salvari credimus. . . ." Etsi *exemplo*, 18 December, 1208 in: Henricus Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (St. Louis: Herder, 1947) No. 423.

[19] "Tenendum quippe ex fide est, extra Apostolicam Romanam Ecclesiam salvum fieri neminem posse, hanc esse unicam salutis arcam, hanc qui non fuerit ingressus, diluvio periturum . . ." Pius IX, *Singulari quadam*, 9 December, 1854; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, *op. cit.*, No. 1647.

[20] "Sed notissimum quoque est catholicum dogma, neminem scilicet extra Catholicam Ecclesiam posse salvari, et contumaces adversus eiusdem Ecclesiae auctoritatem, definitiones, et ab ipsius Ecclesiae unitate atque a Petri successore Romano Pontifice, cui vineae custodia a Salvatore est commissa, pertinaciter divisos aeternam non posse obtinere salutem." Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, 10 August, 1863; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, *op. cit.*, No. 1677.

[21] Luke 10:16.

[22] Matt. 18:17.

[23] Pius IX, *Singulari quadam*; Denziger, *Enchiridion*, *op. cit.*, No. 1647: " . . . sed tamen pro certo partier habendum est, qui verae religionis ignorantia laborent, si ea sit invincibilis, nulla ipsos obstringi huiusce rei culpa ante oculos Domini. Nunc vero quis tantum sibi arroget, ut huiusmodi ignorantia designare limites queat juxta populorum, regionum, ingeniorum, aliarumque rerum tam multarum rationem et varietatem? Ennuvero cum soluti corporeis hisce vinculis videbimus Deum sicuti est (1 Jo. 3.2) intelligimus profecto, quam arcto pulchroque nexu miseratio ac justitia divina copulentur; quamdiu vero in terris versamur mortali gravati molo, quae laebetat animam, firmiss-

ime teneamus ex catholica doctrina *unum Deum esse, unam fidem, unum baptisma* (Eph. 4:5); ulterius inquirendo progredi nefas est."

[24] See Michael d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1927), I, 152-153.

[25] Pius IX, *Quanto conficiamur moerore*; Denziger, *Enchiridion op. cit.*, No. 1677: " . . . Notum Nobis vobisque est, eos, qui invincibili circa sanctissimam nostram religionem ignorantia laborant, quique naturalem legem eiusque praecepta in omnium cordibus a Deo insculpta sedulo servantes ac Deo oboedire parati, honestam rectamque vitam agunt, posse, divinae lucis et gratiae operante virtute, aeternam consequi vitam, cum Deus, qui omnium mentes, animos, cogitationes, habitusque plane intuetur, scrutatur et noscit, pro summa sua bonitate et clementia minime patiatur, quempiam aeternis puniri suppliciis, qui voluntariae culpae reatum non habeat."

[26] See Michael d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, *op. cit.*, I, 152-153

Of interest in this connection are the following:

John Keble raises the question: "A dutiful person in the English Church, we will suppose, has in some way been made aware of the sayings and feelings of good Roman Catholics concerning her; and with the fact that some of these sayings meet with more or less countenance in antiquity; or he has come to be greatly impressed with the sanctity and other attractions undeniably existing in the communion of Rome, and the thought begins to haunt him, 'What if her exclusive claim be true? What if it should prove, that, as yet, I have been living without the pale of Christ's Kingdom?' " Later, he gives the following specious arguments to prevent such a person from pursuing the obvious demands of conscience: "We may ask ourselves, which of two decisions is more in unison, first with contentment; secondly, with intellectual modesty; thirdly, with contrition; fourthly, with love of sanctity in others; fifthly, with fear of giving offense." *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, (Oxford: Parker, 1847) p. 3, 21.

On the other hand, John Henry Newman wrote to J.R. Bloxam: " . . . I don't at all like your staying where you are with your *clear* views. I understand people waiting in the English Church *to know the truth*, but you know it, you have no doubt of it. My dear fellow, will you not have to answer for knowing it? Now do become one of us. . . ." R.D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947) p. 190 (Italics in the original.)

[27] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes*, *Acta et Decreta . . . concilii Vaticani*, col. 8; Eng. tr., pp. 53, 56.

[28] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, *AAS*, XXXV, 243; Eng. tr., p. 44.

CHAPTER THREE

The Way to Unity

1. THE BASIC PRINCIPLE

We have seen that the reunion of Christendom requires a clear determination of the facts involving the precise status of the parties concerned and the obligations which are implied in the realization of such status. With the aid of Divine Revelation, history, and objective reasoning we have discovered that the main line of cleavage in the Christian world lies between the Catholic Church and the other bodies which have separated from her faith and communion. One Anglican writer, referring to the first thousand years of the Christian era, declares:

> What, then, was this Catholic Church? The important thing for us to note is that during this period there was one definite visible society which could rightly claim this name, and that there was no apparent rival, no other body which could compete with it. The Church which claimed to be such was the Universal Church, and a person looking at it from outside would have little difficulty in identifying it.[1]

This, of course, is a statement of fact. But it implies a certain blurring of visibility after the first millenium. What the writer seems to ignore is the central fact which made the Universal Church in that period identifiable as such: that fact was communion with the Holy See. That principle of identification was, for those first thousand years, accepted by all as having been established by Christ Himself. In 251 A.D. St. Cyprian declared: "There is one God and one Christ and one Church and one Chair founded upon Peter by the voice of the Lord. There cannot be set up another altar nor can there arise a new priesthood save that one altar and one priesthood. Whoever gathers elsewhere, scatters."[2]

In an earlier chapter we have shown that what is here seen as

true for the first thousand years, will be true forever, because of the immutable will of Christ. On the other hand, no other body has even the shadow of a claim to be historical Christianity.[3] As a matter of fact, they date their origin from a point in time subsequent to those first thousand years; at that point, namely, when they abandoned the faith or communion of the See of Peter. In consequence of this, as we have shown in the last chapter, they are not members of the Church of Christ; they have no part in the promises made to that Church; they are obliged to seek reunion with that Church. (This obligation, of course, is in the *objective* order—inasmuch as a person must be related to the Church by at least an implicit intention to be saved; in the *subjective* order, the obligation becomes operative when a person suspects or realizes the intrinsic relationship between his actual membership in the Church and his eternal salvation.)

Confused Notions

Now we come to the basic principle involved in the reunion of Christendom. One writer gives expression to a current and quite common notion among non-Catholic ecumenists:

> Union will not mean the surrender of any existing body to another, or the absorption of any existing body in another, and it will not mean the creation of a new united Church. It will mean the absorption of all of us into the one Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ's own foundation, of which all baptized Christian of all Communions in all the world are already members. It will mean defeat for none, and victory—victory in Christ—for all. All that we shall lose will be our sectarian divisions.[4]

This conception, in its broad lines, as applied to all those out of communion with the Holy See, is true enough with reservations (on membership.) However, if the Catholic Church in communion with the Holy See is included in the mass of sects (as the author does include it), then the notion is irrational, as it ignores and overturns the facts of history and virtually denies the facts of Divine Revelation and the promises of Christ. In this conception, the Catholic Church has no more reality than the *Republic* of Plato.

Clear Facts

The reunion of Christendom will not, indeed, mean the fusing of

sects, but the return of all out of communion with the Holy See, which is alone the "one Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ's own foundation."[8] The Holy Office reminded the Anglican unionists: "... You will also see that every effort at reconciliation must needs be in vain, except on condition of those principles on which the Church was at first founded by Christ, and thenceforth in every succeeding age propagated one and the same throughout the world by the Apostles and their successors ..."[9]

In view of this admonition, and as a logical consequence of the earlier considerations which we have urged, it can be clearly seen that the reunion of Christendom will consist of a restoration to communion with the Holy See.

Phases of Reconciliation

In this respect, we may discern four phases: In the first place, the movement towards unity is designated by the word, "return." Pius XI said:

> Let them return, then, to the common father of all. He has forgotten the unjust wrongs inflicted upon the Holy See and will receive them most lovingly. ... Let these separated children return to the Apostolic See ... not indeed with the idea or hope that the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth, will abandon the integrity of the faith and bear their errors, but to subject themselves to its teaching authority and rule.[10]

This return is a movement from a present condition of error and confusion to the light and supernatural vitality of Catholic faith and communion. Since, "by the precept and appointment of Christ, and by an absolute necessity, that the faith and communion of the Roman Church be accepted,"[11] it is imperative that this movement be initiated and pursued.

In the second place, on the part of the Church, the proper function is "reception." Pope Pius IX wrote:

> ... and since, notwithstanding our unworthiness, we hold the office of His Vicar upon earth, with outstretched hands we wait in the most ardent desire the return of our erring sons to the Catholic Church, so that we may receive them most lovingly into the house of our heavenly Father, and may enrich them with His inexhaustible treasures.[12]

As Vicar of Christ, the Pope is the "keeper of the keys" to the

one fold; as one whose "binding and loosing" is ratified in Heaven, he formally incorporates them into Catholic unity. This reception in no sense implies a degradation of personal dignity on the part of the non-Catholic, but rather an elevation of status and the conferring of a real benefit in view of the privileges of restored membership. Even as separated, they are regarded as "children" of the Church, by reason of their baptismal character.

In the third place, the proper effect of this return is actual "membership" in the Church of Christ. Pius XII declared: "May they then enter into Catholic unity, and united with Us in the organic oneness of the Body of Christ may they hasten to the one Head in the society of glorious love. With persevering prayer to the Spirit of love and truth We wait for them with open arms to return not to a stranger's house, but to their own, their Father's house."[13]

Finally, the whole process of reunion has the character of "reconciliation."

As Leo XIII pointed out: "Weigh carefully in your minds and before God the nature of Our request. It is not for any human motive, but impelled by divine charity and the desire for the salvation of all, that We advise the reconciliation and union with the Church of Rome ..."[14]

Historical Precedent

In confirmation of the fact that this basic principle of reunion is not something new, drawn up *ad hoc* in view of a contemporary situation, we go back more than fourteen hundred years to the Acacian schism. For thirty-five years, at this time, the Byzantine Church was in schism from the Holy See. Before union was restored in 519 A.D. all the bishops of the Eastern Church (except Nestorians and Monophysites) signed the "Formula of Pope Hormisdas."[15] We bring it in here, because two of the official documents which we have cited refer to it.[16] Part of it reads as follows:

> The first salvation is to keep the rule of right faith and in no way wander from the laws of the Fathers. And that the sentence of Our Lord Jesus Christ saying, "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church," cannot be set aside. These words which have been uttered are proved by their effects, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has ever been kept without stain. From which hope and faith wishing to be by no means separated, and following the laws of the Fathers, we anathematize all heresies ... following in all things the Apostolic See, and preaching all its laws.

And therefore I hope that I may be deserving to be in one communion with you, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the full and true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion: promising in the future that the names of those who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, those who do not consent to the Apostolic See, shall not be recited in the holy mysteries. But if in anything I attempt to stray from my profession, I confess myself by my own sentence to be an accomplice of those whom I have condemned. This my profession I have signed with my own hand and address to you, Hormisdas, holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome."

2. *THE MANNER OF REUNION*

Having established the fact that reconciliation with the Holy See is the basic principle of the reunion of Christendom, which issues in membership in the one Church of Christ, there now remains a consideration as to how this is to be effected. Of course, there is no problem with regard to individual convert. Canon 1350 declares: "Ordinaries and pastors should regard the non-Catholics living in their dioceses and parishes as their wards in Jesus Christ. In other territories the entire care for the missions among non-Catholics is reserved exclusively to the Holy See."[8]

The proper agency for the reconciliation of the individual convert is the local Ordinary or Pastor; by being received by them, he is thereby in communion with the Holy See." But the main question raised in the problem of "reunion" has been whether this is best effected by *Corporate* reunion or *Individual* conversions. To consider the problem in terms of its complete historical and practical ramifications is not within the determined scope of this dissertation. However, certain definite principles will be laid down drawn from authoritative sources, historical experience, and the resources of common sense.

Section 1: *Corporate reunion in itself*

We shall first give our attention to the notion of Corporate Reunion considered in itself. In a broad sense, corporate reunion is the movement of a society of baptized dissidents into actual membership in the Church. It can be called a "reunion" by reason of the baptismal character of each member of the separated society. Valid baptism given in infancy constituted them as members of the Church until they reached the age of reason, at which time, the

other external bonds of unity were required; valid baptism, received in adult life, in a separated society did not make them actual members, but created a sacramental-moral bond rendering them subjects of Church authority. (If received in good faith, they were related to the Church by an implicit intention, sharing unconsciously in its life, but deprived of many of the benefits of actual membership; this sharing in the life of the Church remains as long as the person is invincibly ignorant and is in the state of sanctifying grace.)

A. *Heterodox conceptions*

Before proceeding on this subject, it will be necessary to indicate some heterodox conceptions of corporate reunion which we must unequivically reject:

As Regards the Point of Departure

In the first place, we reject those that err as regards the point of departure (even though communion with the Holy See is the goal). The main error, here, is the "divided church" theory. As an Anglican, Newman phrased it as follows:

> You know the time was when there was one vast body of Christians, called the Church, throughout the world. It was found in every country where Christ was named . . . That vast Catholic body, "the Holy Church throughout the world," is broken into many fragments by the power of the Devil . . . Some portions of it are altogether gone, and those that remain are separated from each other . . . The unity of the Catholic Church is very near my heart, only I do not see any prospect of it in our time. . . . It is our theory that each diocese is an integral Church, intercommunion being a duty (and the breach of it a sin), but not essential to Catholicity."[9]

This is an expression of the famous "Branch Theory" which reduced the Church to three "branches" *viz.*, Roman, Anglican and Greek. One of the purposes of two writings of the Holy Office (*Apostolici sedi* and *Quod vos*) was to condemn this notion. For example, the Holy Office declared:

> You must beware lest in seeking it, (i.e. unity) you turn aside from the way . . . you imagine that those Christian communities which claim to have inherited the priesthood and the name Catholic, constitute portions of the true Church of Jesus Christ, though divided

and separated from the Apostolic See of Peter. Nothing is more contrary to the true idea of the Catholic Church than such a notion."[19]

Closely akin to this notion, though, in many respects considerably different is the Gallican orientation of reunion negotiations. It conceives reunion as an intercommunion of national churches under the presidency of the Pope. An instance of this can be seen in the correspondence between Dr. Wake of Canterbury and Dr. Dupin of Paris in the eighteenth century. A summary of Dupin's notions are as follows: "He seems to have thought that the Pope can exercise no immediate jurisdiction within the dioceses of the bishops, and that his primacy invested him with no more than a general conservation of the deposit of the faith, a right to enforce observance of the sacred canons, and the general maintenance of discipline."[20] This, too, must be rejected as contrary to the divinely-given constitution of the Church. Pius XI probably had this in mind when he wrote: "Among them are also a few, though a very few, who indulge the Roman Pontiff with a primacy of honor or a certain jurisdiction or power which, however, they think is derived not from divine right but in a certain manner from the consent of the faithful."[21]

As Regards the Terminus

In the second place, there are those who err as regards the terminus of reunion. (We refer here only to those who do, indeed, look towards the Holy See, but err as regards the manner of conjunction with it.)

Under this heading, we reject anything resembl..ng what goes by the name of "mutual recognition." According to this notion, two religious bodies, as sovereign states acting through comity arrangements, provide for a relative intercommunion. This can be seen in the following agreement between the "Old Catholics" and the Anglicans:

> 1. Each communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
> 2. Each communion agrees to admit members of the other communion to participate in the sacraments.
> 3. Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practise characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian Faith."[22]

This procedure would diametrically contradict the doctrine of the unicity of the Church as well as its necessity for salvation. Pope Pius IX urged: ". . . we would have it that your episcopal solicitude and watchfulness be aroused to the extent that you will devote the greatest possible energy in combatting and driving from the minds of men that deadly and impious notion, namely, that the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion."[23]

For this same reason we must reject "federal union":

> By federal union we have understood any form of official union between denominations as a whole which leaves their original organization unimpaired and reserves for each of the units thus united a large field of independent power, authority and initiative. The best known example is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America."[24]

This fosters the indifference against which the Pontiff inveighs.

As Regards the Act of Reunion

In the third place, there are those who err in regard to the act of reunion itself. (Again, we repeat, we are concerned only with those involving union with the Holy See.) Among non-Catholic ecumenists, there are two principal ways of approaching the problem of reunion: compromise and comprehension.

"*The way of compromise*" looks to what are called "fundamentals" and similarities of belief or polity as a basis or fulcrum of union. The word "compromise" has a pejorative savor, hence it is not used, but the thing signified by the word certainly forms part of some programs of union. For example, the proposed basis of union under consideration by the Protestant Episcopalians and the Presbyterians of the United States has the following declaration under the heading, "Doctrinal:"

> Both Churches accept the Scriptures . . . the Apostles Creed and the Nicene Creed . . . The confessions of faith and the Book of Common Prayer . . . [etc.] . . . The Basis of Union permits any teaching of the united Church to use for instruction any teaching in the formularies authorized in either of the united Churches before the union, provided such teaching is consistent with the basis of union . . . whenever definite conflicts are disclosed between the formularies . . . such conflicting teachings shall not be taught as necessary for salvation or so as to break fellowship in the united Church."[25]

This conception is based on a distinction between what are called fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, and thereby contradicts the nature of divine revelation and the idea of faith. Pius XI noted: "In matters of faith it is not permitted to make a distinction between fundamental and so-called non-fundamental articles of faith, as if the first ought to be held by all and the second the faithful are free to accept or not. The supernatural virtue of faith has as its formal cause the authority of God the Revealer, which suffers not such a division."[28]

"*The way of comprehension*" envisions the incorporation of differences of every kind:

> Now this idea of comprehension is the modern contribution to ecclesiology or the doctrine of the Church. The old method was to search for similarities; the new method is to recognize diversities. The Church's true policy here is not rejection, but adjustment; not insistence, but assistance . . . Each sect is a facet in God's great diamond of truth, flashing prismatic hues, the union of which makes the white light.[29]
>
> No Christian Communion could give up that which it believes to be essential to the revelation received in Christ, nor could it desire any other Communion to do this. . . . The question is not what each Communion is willing to surrender, but what each communion has to contribute that is true and vital and from God."[30]

This comprehension can proceed either from a liberal orientation which aims at the convergence of contradictions or the modernist *ethos* looking for a coalescence of sentiment, neither of which is rational.[31] This, too, is rejected by the Church. Pius XI wrote: "How could a Christian covenant be imagined in which they who entered it could in matters of faith each retain, although contrary to those of others, their own opinions and judgements? Through what agreement could men of opposed opinions become one and the same society of the faithful?"[32]

All Factors of Unity Required

The foregoing theories of reunion have been rejected chiefly because they are in no way compatible with membership in the one Church of Christ. No individual or group, who are deficient in some essential factor of that unity, may enter the Church. The entire Catholic Faith must be accepted in an unequivocal sense in all its ambit, without any reservations of any kind. Moreover, the reunion

will involve full and unfeigned obedience to all authority of the Church, within its proper sphere, most especially to the Vicar of Christ. No "terms" can be discussed which would in any way derogate from these conditions. As a matter of fact, every convert is called upon to make a full profession of faith and an unqualified abjuration of all errors previously held.

B. *Notion and kinds*

Now, granting that all these conditions are realized *viz.*, that no heretical conception is operative in the pursuit of reunion and that the persons in question make a profession of the full Catholic Faith and obedience to the Holy See (or at least manifest a desire to be in a position of such obedience) what then? Is each individual bound to make his individual reunion or is the whole body, functioning as such bound to make corporate reunion? We shall first consider this question of corporate reunion in the abstract; then we shall examine briefly several concrete applications.

There are many kinds of corporate reunion; they may be classed according to the *act* and according to the *agent*:

As Regards the Act of Reunion

Considered in terms of the *Act* of reunion itself, corporate reunion can be divided into *formal* and *material*:

Formal corporate reunion may be defined as that act whereby a society of baptized persons, professing the full Catholic Faith, enter the Church through a juridically authorized action of legitimate representatives. For example, the Union of Brest-Litovsk whereby the Ruthenian schismatics entered the fold. On June 12, 1595, the Archbishop of Kiev (a schismatic) and the other bishops associated with him, addressed Pope Clement VIII as follows:

> Most Holy Father, supreme ruler and shepherd of the Church of Christ . . . Calling in mind the agreement in all things and union of the Oriental and Western Church which our ancestors cultivated under the obedience and government of the Holy Apostolic Roman See . . . we have prayed to the Lord that He might . . . aggregate us to the unity of faith . . . that bound by the bond of this union under the obedience and government of your holiness, that with one heart and mouth we all might glorify and praise the most holy name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost . . .[33]

This union was happily achieved and abides to this day. With the canonical process involved, we are not here concerned. One feature of formal corporate reunion is the fact that, after the reunion, some corporate status is retained. That is, sacred rites which correspond to Catholic rites are permitted to remain (e.g. Byzantine form which is used by both Catholics and Dissidents), diocesan appointments and ecclesiastical customs which existed before the breach (e.g. married clergy) are also permitted.

Material corporate reunion, on the other hand, is the return to the Church of a body of men who make profession of the full Catholic Faith, and are received rather as individuals and possess no distinctive corporate status after the reunion. For example, in 1899, the Apostolic Delegate of Mesopotamia reported to Leo XIII that thirty thousand Gregorian Armenians had entered the Church;" these would come under the existing Catholic Armenian Patriarch.

Midway between a formal and a material corporate reunion is what may be called a "*group*" reunion. This happens when a number of like-minded individuals enter the Church at the same time. For example, the Society of the Atonement, an American Episcopalian community, petitioned Monsignor Falconio, Apostolic Delegate, in August 19, 1909 as follows:

> . . . It is as a Society we ask for this admission, and our appeal is to the Holy Father for his sanction, protection and governance, in order that the Name and Institute, which we believe we have derived from Our Lord Jesus Christ, may be confirmed to us by his Vicar . . . In conclusion we wish to assure the Holy Father, through your Excellency, that God has already bestowed upon us the gift of supernatural faith in every dogma of the Holy Catholic and Roman Church, and we abhor and detest all heresies—especially Modernism —contrary to the same. . . .

The same Apostolic Delegate replied on October 6, 1909 as follows:

> . . . His Eminence (Cardinal Merry del Val) directs me to inform you, in the name of the Holy Father, that his Holiness (Blessed Pius X) is much gratified to learn of your resolution and that of your community, and that he hopes and prays for the happy outcome of your good dispositions. With regard to your community there will be no objection to its continuing in the same way, even after its union with the Catholic Church. . . ."

As Regards the Agent Reuniting

Corporate reunion may also be considered in terms of the *agent* who is reuniting with the Holy See; this may be divided according to the quality of the body in question i.e. *schismatic* or *heretical*.

When a body is purely *schismatic*, that is to say, is defective in charity or obedience to the Holy See, yet has preserved a doctrinal orthodoxy and a validly consecrated hierarchy, all other things being equal, it is in a position of making a *formal* corporate reunion, as above described.

On the other hand, an heretical body, now convinced of the full Catholic Faith and desirous of communion with the Holy See is in a position of making a *material* corporate reunion i.e. it possesses no distinct corporate status after entrance into the Church. The reason for this is obvious. Private judgement is the basis of such bodies and the societies are formed of individuals linked by some common denominator. Each member has to obtain the gift of faith and his pursuit of Catholic communion is an implicit rejection of the errors which the denomination embodied. There could never be such an anomaly, for example, as a Catholic Lutheran Church: by becoming Catholics, they would cease to be Lutherans. There is no reason for any distinctive corporate status over and above their membership in the Church.

Moral Principle Involved

The moral principle involved is personal salvation. This is the primary operative consideration. God wills all men to be members of the one Church of Christ and has placed an intrinsic relationship between their membership in that Church and their eternal salvation. The Church, in conformity with God's will, has invited all baptized persons, who are separated from her, to return to their true home, by profession of the one faith, reception of the same sacraments and obedience to God's own Vicar on earth, the Roman Pontiff.

Section 2: Some applications

The time has come for specific applications of the foregoing principles. We intend to note here briefly the relation between the Graeco-Russian dissident bodies and the Anglican communion relative to the question of corporate reunion. Each of these questions could well form the subject of many volumes, but we shall confine ourselves to the primary considerations.

A. *The Graeco-Russian Bodies*

As regards the Graeco-Russian bodies, the Holy See has, on many occasions, not only indicated the possibility, but the desirability of their corporate return to the Church in the *formal* sense which we have described. This fact may be inferred from the way in which the Pontiffs address them. The document, "*Arcano Divinae Providentiae*" of Pius IX prior to the Vatican Council, was addressed: "*Ad omnes episcopos Ecclesiarum ritus orientalis, communionem cum Apostolica Sede non habentes.*"[36] He addresses the bishops of these bodies, inviting them to unity. But in the same Pontiff's letter, "*In suprema Petri*" of January 6, 1848, we read a most remarkable invitation:

> . . . In this respect we urge and beseech you that, without any further delay, you return to communion with this Holy See of Peter, in which the foundation of the true Church of Christ as both the tradition of your own ancestors and other ancient Fathers as well as the words of Christ, Our Lord, related in the Holy Gospels which we have noted, demonstrate . . . And so, we impose no other burden upon than these necessary things, namely, that you consent to return to unity with us in the profession of the true Faith, which the Catholic Church holds and teaches, and with the Church itself you keep communion with the See of Peter. Hence, in what touches upon your sacred rites, only those things will be expunged which are opposed to the same Faith and Catholic unity, if such slipped into them in the time of separation: once these are removed, your ancient oriental liturgies will remain safe and fixed . . . Moreover, it has been determined and fixed by us that, as regards sacred ministers, priests and prelates who return from these nations to Catholic unity will have the same position they now hold which Our Predecessors, both of recent and earlier date, have been wont to do; that, namely, we will keep for them the same rank and dignities . . . Finally, we shall embrace both them and the laity, who return to our communion, with the same love as we do the other Catholics of the East.[37]

Hence, it is evident that the Holy See regards a *formal* corporate reunion on the part of the Oriental dissidents as possible and desirable. But in speaking of it, it is not quite accurate to call the reconciliation a "union of churches" but rather a simple "union with the Church."[38] Moreover, it is not quite in keeping with truth or real charity to refer to these bodies as "orthodox" in a technical sense (other than as a conventional name) because they profess many things which differ from what right faith would dictate. The Popes have

used the terms, *fratres separati* or *dissidentes*, which abstract from whether their heresy or schism is formal or not.[39]

What saves the Graeco-Russian bodies from the charge of being heretical as well as schismatic may be from the fact that there is no teaching authority universally accepted other than the content of the first seven Ecumenical councils. Of course, some individual theologians or schools of thought have professed propositions contrary to Catholic teachings, but the bodies themselves are not identified with these teachings.[40] Needless to say, though, before union is achieved, these bodies must profess the entire Catholic Faith, including such matters as have been definitively solved by the Church.[41]

Need of Careful Application

The general principle, as regards the possibility of a formal corporate reunion of these bodies with the Holy See, must be measured against a concrete situation and applied accordingly. Mar Severios, a convert bishop of the Syro-Malankara Antiochean Rite, observes:

> Corporate reunion has always been the ideal of the dissidents, and it is so even now. Till a hundred years ago it was possible. The dissidents do not form one Church now, much less are they one in faith. In the same house one can find members adhering to different faiths and practices. . . .[42]

Such questions as this must come under consideration, because they affect the quality of the agent pursuing reunion. We shall see very shortly how the question may be solved.

The Question of Time

We must also note another factor involved in the question of formal corporate reunion and that is the question of time. In the letter of Pius IX, quoted above, we observe the words, "without any further delay." These words are very significant. We note in the union of Brest-Litovsk that an ecclesiastical province entered into communion with the Church. It did not wait for the rest of the Graeco-Russian body to move with them the moment they perceived the peril involved in their state and the consequent obligation to seek reunion with the Holy See.

Serviceable Pattern of Reconciliation

In our own day, we have what may well serve as a pattern for the reconciliation of Oriental Dissidents. In November of 1926 a synod of Bishops of the Jacobite body in South India authorized one, Mar Ivanios, to seek out possibilities of reunion with the Holy See. After about four years of study, the Holy See came to a favorable decision. At this time, the situation had changed due to some deaths having taken place and only two of the original members of the synod were prepared to carry through with the decision. As it happened, on September 20, 1930 Archbishop Mar Ivanios and Bishop Theophilus, together with a priest, a deacon and a layman were received into the Church. This was a form of "group" reunion. Pope Pius XI then set up a new ecclesiastical province of the Syro-Malankara Antiochean Rite, composed, namely, of an Archdiocese of Trivandrum and a diocese of Tiruvalla. Later, two other bishops, Mar Dioscorus and Mar Severios came into the Church. With this as a nucleus, groups of families in increasing numbers were reconciled to the Church; until today there have been some eighty priests and over fifty thousand of the faithful have come into the Church, and, through missionary activity among the pagan population over twenty thousand more have been added. This species of reunion would rather meet the definition of a *material* corporate reunion (masses of individual conversions) rather than a *formal* corporate reunion.[4] It is a serviceable pattern for the reconciliation of Eastern Dissidents to the Church.

Individual Responsibility

Any individual member or groups of members in an Eastern Dissident body, who have dissipated invincible ignorance and come to know the Church as she is, and the fact that they are external to it, are bound to seek reunion independently. If they do not, they become guilty of the sin of formal schism. Personal salvation is the primary consideration. In the event of their reunion, they do not become Latin Catholics without a special indult, but rather become associated with the Catholic Rite corresponding to the one they left (e.g. Byzantine.) In view of present historical contingencies, it appears unlikely that a formal corporate reunion is possible in countries subject to the Soviet tyranny; in this case, individual or group reconciliations are most advisable whenever possible.

B. *Anglicans and other Protestant bodies*

As regards Protestants in general, the Popes have not been wont to address the religious societies as such, in their appeals for return. For example, Pius IX wrote an encyclical before the Vatican Council (*Iam vos omnes*, 13, Sept., 1868) addressing, "*Ad omnes protestantes, aliosque acatholicos.*"[5] The appeal is made directly to the individuals in these bodies.

Protestants in General

The reason for addressing the individuals of these bodies, as we have noted, is the principle of private judgment, which is the foundation upon which these bodies function. In the government of most of these bodies, whatever authority there is, comes mediately or immediately from the congregations, or, at times, from the State (as in Scandinavian countries). If an entire congregation desires to enter Catholic unity, each member from the minister down must undergo instructions; each must make his own profession of faith (no one else can make it for him); each must be received as an individual. It will be a corporate reunion in a *material* sense only, by reason of the fact that a body moves into the Church simply as a mass of people individually received. They all become members of the Catholic Church and no longer constitute a distinctive congregation (e.g. as Lutherans or Presbyterians.)

In this kind of *material* corporate reunion, which is very rare, there is no reason for anyone to wait for another; each one has to consider his own salvation. To remain outside the Church, when sufficiently enlightened, is to incur the grave sin of formal schism or voluntary material heresy, thus imperilling eternal salvation.[6] A minister who is convinced of the truth of the Catholic Church and of his obligation of seeking communion with it, would gravely deceive himself if he were to wait until his entire congregation were similarly minded; he would do more for that congregation by giving them the example of his own conversion.

Some years ago, a survey on unity was made and 624 ministers were polled on certain propositions. One of these propositions read as follows: "Christ gave authority to govern the Church to Peter as the chief apostle and his legitimate successors."[7] In a weighted score, 3.0 percent of Lutherans (to take one example) registered their opinion on this as "certainly true." Now, *all other things being equal*, these

ministers profess themselves to be formal schismatics, i.e. knowing the head of the Church they refuse to be in communion with him, or as voluntary material heretics if they refuse to investigate further. God alone is the judge of the consciences of individuals, but, on general principles, they are in grave danger.

Anglicans in Particular

As regards the Anglicans, they deserve a special consideration if only because formal corporate reunion in their case has been, at times, seriously regarded as at least remotely feasible. The first thing to note about them is that their position relative to the Church is the same as that of the other Protestants. The Establishment is Protestant in its origins; its official teachings (if it has any now which would deserve that title is open to question) at least were Protestant, imported with the aid of continental reformers. Certain superficial resemblances to the Church were retained, such as titles like "bishops," "priests," "canons" etc., but the sacramental realities underlying them were completely lost. They were retained because such titles fitted in with the idea of royality and gave the sovereign a suitable machinery for controlling the Church and bestowing its offices on politically deserving subjects."

It will not be to our purpose to outline here the history of the Anglican Establishment and the various private or semi-official tentatives of reunion that have taken place. They proved ineffective due to insufficient authority, erroneous premises and divergent aims. However, it will be useful to note certain facts which have taken place within the past century or so.

Oxford Movement

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century, what has come to be known as the "Oxford Movement" set in motion a series of changes in the Establishment. It began as feeble stirrings of earnest men in reaction to a nascent liberalism and it grew in vigor as time went on. The main effort of these men was to restore to the Establishment the theology of the non-jurors of the seventeenth century. These latter men were greatly devoted to the study of the ancient Fathers of the Church. They interpreted the Fathers in protestant fashion, of course i.e. with private judgement; but they did have a definite, but very tenuous conception of tradition. The

Oxford men began the study of the Fathers in earnest and after much study came to the notion of the importance of the "dogmatic principle" in the life of the Church. With further study they learned that this dogmatic principle required a visible teaching Church endowed with authority from Christ. Then came a recognition of the importance of the sacramental ordinances instituted by Christ, and the consequent dignity of the office of bishops. Privately, some of these men discovered that the ancient Church was certainly not Anglican in spirit or tendency, but rather Roman or Papal. This was very disturbing. Some pursued their investigations to their logical conclusions; others recoiled at the prospect and formulated new theories to adjust themselves with this knowledge—the chief recourse was the "divided-church theory."

In all of this there was no question of reunion with Rome, as such. The Oxford men constituted themselves as apostles to publicize their discoveries with a view to restoring the Establishment to what they considered her "catholic heritage." They met with intense opposition, especially from the authorities whose office they extolled. The ideas they were propagating were completely foreign to the Anglican spirit and tradition. Yet sufficient numbers were gathered to constitute a "party" in the Establishment, which still exists today.

There was always a great fear in the party lest their numbers should be lessened by "secession" of its members to the "Roman Branch" because thereby their influence would wane and the Anglican Establishment would be irretrievably lost to liberalism and evangelicism (which were labels of the competing parties). So, many specious arguments were devised to check the Roman tendencies which cropped up on various occasions. Dean Church observes:

> The tendency of this section of able men was unquestionably Romewards, almost from the beginning . . . But with whatever perplexity and perhaps impatience, Mr. Newman's power held them back. He kept before their minds continually those difficulties of fact which stood in the way . . . It was when the tremendous question took shape, Is the English Church a true Church, a real part of the Church Catholic?—when the question came to his mind more and more doubtful, at length, disparate—that they, of course, became more difficult to satisfy . . ."

The increasing suspicion that Rome represented the true Church and that they were external to it, gave rise to serious anxiety of conscience. Every human motive revolted at such a suggestion; any

straw would be seized as a plank of safety in the face of the on-rushing tide of such disturbing suggestions. At one point in 1839, Newman wrote to Frederick Rogers:

> . . . just as those who sin after baptism cannot at once return to their full privileges, yet are not without hope, so a Church which has broken away from the center of unity is not at liberty at once to return, yet it is not nothing. May she not put herself into a state of penance? Are not her children best fulfilling their duty to her—not by leaving her, but promoting her return, and not thinking they have a *right* to rush into such a higher state as communion with the center of unity might give them. . . .[1]

One year later, writing to the same, he says:

> On the whole though I cannot draw out my reasons, I am more comfortable than I was . . . My own solicitude has been to have an answer in *controversy* why an *individual* is not bound to leave the English Church. That we are suffering dreadfully (so are the Romans), and that we are wrong in our separation, I do not doubt. It is quite consistent to say that I think Rome the center of unity, and yet not to say she is infallible when she is by herself . . . We have so many things on our side that a good conscience is all that one wants.[2]

Here we find an expression of a state of mind to which a notion of formal corporate reunion would serve as a useful means of transferring a personal obligation to the group of which he is a member. Now, we know that Newman, as an Anglican, never seriously expected such a reunion in his own lifetime and, in the long run, he regarded it as extremely unlikely;[3] as a Catholic, he had no sympathy with the notion at all.[4] Yet the type of reasoning, which we have indicated, greatly impressed his followers. Pope Gregory XVI said to Frederick William Faber, (when Faber was an Anglican):

> . . . he said to me, "You must not mislead yourself in wishing for unity, yet waiting for your *Church* to move. Think of the salvation of your own soul." I said I feared self-will and *individual* judging. He said, "You are all individuals in the English Church, you have only external communion, and the accident of being all under the Queen . . . You must think for yourself and for your soul." He then laid his hands on my shoulders, and I immediately knelt down; upon which he laid them on my head, and said, "*May the grace of God correspond to your good wishes and deliver you from the nets of Anglicanism, and bring you to the true Holy Church.*" . . ."[5]

The conversion of Newman and his few immediate followers into the Church greatly unsettled the party; some elected to follow his example; the rest clung to such leaders as E.B. Pusey, who stayed behind.

A. P. U. C.

The idea of formal corporate reunion took definite shape in 1857 with the formation of the "Association for the promotion of the union of Christendom" (A.P.U.C.). This was styled by some as "A Plaster for Unquiet Consciences."[6] Catholics, Anglicans and Eastern Dissidents formed its membership. It was condemned in 1864 and again in 1865 by the Holy Office, (namely the *Apostolici sedi* and *Quod voy* which have been quoted extensively throughout this dissertation.) The chief reason for the condemnation was the basic assumption of the "branch theory." A significant clause in the *Quod eos* was, " . . . we would have you hesitate no longer to take refuge in the bosom of that Church, which, by the acknowledgement of all mankind, holds the supreme authority by the succession of its bishops from the Apostolic See . . ."[7] Those words sounded the death-knell of any hope for a formal corporate reunion, because those to whom the grace of the Catholic Faith has been offered are to "hesitate no longer" in seeking communion with the Holy See. There would be no need for them to wait for anyone else, because all that could be hoped for would be a reunion that would be corporate in a material sense only; they would carry out the purpose of their movement and enforce it by their own example by their own conversion. The *Apostolici sedi* had already warned Catholics:

> . . . Catholics who join this society are giving both to Catholics and non-Catholics an occasion of spiritual ruin: more especially because the society, by holding out a vain expectation of those three communions, each in its integrity, and keeping to its own persuasion, coalescing into one, leads the minds of non-Catholics away from conversion to the faith, and, by the journals which it publishes, endeavors to prevent it. . . ."[8]

It is a vain expectation, which, in fact, seeks to prevent what it professes to promote i.e. return to the Church.

Portal and Halifax

In the year 1889-1890 a chance meeting between Abbé Fernand Portal and Lord Halifax on the island of Madiera in Spain provoked

a renewal of the clamor for formal corporate reunion. The Abbé received most of his information about Anglicanism from this peer who was the president of the English Church Union. He had the impression that what he was told was the persuasion of the entire Establishment. "Anglo-Catholics" like to identify the entire communion with their own small party. The story is too long to recount here. But the Abbé secured the interest of Pope Leo XIII by giving him a sanguine picture of conditions in England. It seemed that the whole Establishment was ready to come into the Church, or, at least, the greater portion of it. The Pope wrote an encyclical on April 14, 1895. It is significant that it was not addressed to the Anglican Establishment, but, "*Ad Anglos regnum Christi in fidei unitate quaerentes*," that is, to the individuals in England seeking unity. We can note this from his words: "With loving heart, then, We turn to you all in England, to whatever community or institution you may belong, desiring to recall you to this holy unity. We beseech you, as you value your eternal salvation . . . without ceasing to implore light to know the truth in all its fullness, and to embrace the designs of His mercy with single and entire faithfulness . . ."[28]

There is no suggestion of formal corporate reunion to be found in these words. They simply urge prayer and faithfulness to the grace of conversion which each person has to consider himself. If the whole of the English nation, who are separated from the Catholic Church, should desire to enter it, surely they would be welcomed after being instructed and making the required profession of faith, but this would be a corporate reunion in a *material* sense only.

Anglican Orders

In the course of the discussions held at this time, the question of Anglican Orders came up. After due investigation, they were declared invalid. In the document of Leo XIII declaring this fact, we read:

> Perhaps until now aiming at the greater perfection of Christian virtue . . . they have, nevertheless, hesitated in doubt and anxiety to follow the voice of Christ, which so long has interiorly admonished them. Now they see clearly whither He in His goodness invites them and wills them to come. In returning to His one only fold, they will find the blessings which they seek, and the consequent helps to salvation of which He has made the Church the dispenser . . . We wish to direct Our exhortation and Our desires in a special way to those who

> are ministers of religion in their respective communities. . . . Let them be the first in joyfully submitting to the divine call, and obey it, and furnish a glorious example to others. . . ."[29]

These words give no suggestion of formal corporate reunion, but are directed to the consciences of the individuals concerned.

As events turned out, no great impression appears to have been made. Many of the Anglicans attributed the failure of their plans to bad political maneuverings or "hostile" influences in the English Catholic hierarchy. The hope remained undimmed that, possibly, some future Pope would reopen the question and rule differently from Leo XIII. This, of course, is a vain dream. The decision concerning Anglican Orders was determined by the facts and facts are stubborn things; truth is more precious than politics. Still, some Catholics in France seemed to encourage this dream. Abbé Portal continued to edit the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* with this policy. Pope Leo XIII ordered that it cease publication and, in this letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, he wrote:

> . . . no prudent or right-minded person could call into doubt our decision, moreover, Catholics are bound to receive it with the greatest acquiescence as forever firm, finished, irrevocable. . . . when the English Dissidents sought from Us the truth about their ordinations, they seemed to be sincere, and once that truth was shown to them by Us before God, they received it in a far different spirit, it clearly follows that Catholics . . . should know their duty. Hence, it was neither right nor fitting for one to ally himself any longer with these men or in any way to favor their designs; by so doing, one can also place no small obstacle in the way of the hoped-for progress of religion."

"England and the Holy See"

By the turn of the century, the cry for formal corporate reunion revived once again. It took place almost simultaneously in England and the United States. In England, the Reverend Spencer Jones, an Anglican rector wrote a book entitled, "*England and the Holy See*," which was published in 1902. This book was very influential in renewing the Pro-Roman tendencies among members of the Establishment. It made an excellent case for the Primacy of Peter and his successors, but was marred by the taint of the "divided church theory."[30]

Paul James Francis, S.A.

In the United States, an Episcopalian religious community was started, on Franciscan lines, in 1898 at Graymoor, Garrison, New York. It was called the "Society of the Atonement." It consisted of friars and sisters, having for their respective founders, the Rev. Paul James Francis, S.A. (his civil name was Lewis Thomas Wattson) and Mother Lurana Mary Francis, S.A. (her civil name was Lurana Mary White). In October, 1900 Father Paul, as he was called, officially committed the Society of the Atonement to the mission of restoring the Anglican communion to unity with the Holy See. But his notion of the state of things was somewhat different from that of Spencer Jones. He did not hold the "divided church theory." It was rather seen as a condition of separation from the Church. On one occasion, he preached at a deanery meeting and chose for his subject the first miracle of St. Peter reported in the *Acts of the Apostles*, namely, the cure of the lame man outside the temple gate. In this lame man, he saw a type and figure of Anglicanism, prostrate just beyond the door of entrance to the Church."

Chair of Unity Octave

Father Paul and Spencer Jones were in frequent correspondence. In 1907 Spencer Jones suggested that one day each year be set aside as a day for special prayer for unity and indicated the feast of SS. Peter and Paul on June 29th as his choice. Father Paul suggested a better plan. He conceived the notion of using the eight full days embracing the feast of the Chair of Peter at Rome (January 18th) and the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (January 25th) as the best time for the purpose. This was the origin of the *Church Unity Octave* (now known as the *Chair of Unity Octave*.)

The *Octave* was first observed at Graymoor in 1908. On October 30, 1909 the Society made a "group" reunion with the Holy See and was permitted to continue its work of promoting the Octave and winning converts to the Church. A large number of Anglicans followed them into the Church. Shortly after his conversion, Fr. Paul wrote: "We do not expect a corporate submission of *all* Anglicans to the Apostolic See, in either this or any subsequent generation, but we *do* anticipate the home-coming of the Catholic Remnant. How extensive the numbers will prove to be, God alone knows!"[3] Fully acquainted with the facts, his own conversion showed that he

regarded any hope for formal corporate reunion to be impossible, but he did look for one that was corporate in a material sense only, which reduces itself to individual or group conversions.

Malines Conversations

At various times from 1921 to 1925, certain Anglican theologians with Lord Halifax at their head met with Cardinal Mercier at the latter's residence at Malines in Belgium. They were known as the "Malines conversations." The sessions were private and unofficial and issued in failure. This was to be expected. Continental Catholics were especially unsuited to the handling of the Anglican question. They had little competence, at least as regards the nature and constitution of Anglicanism derived from the immediate and daily experience which the English Catholics possessed. William Francis Brown, late Bishop of Southwark, himself a convert from Anglicanism, reports an interview he had at Rome in his memoirs:

> Cardinal Gasquet put my question; Cardinal Mercier seemed much disconcerted, but afterwards became more cordial and confidential, and made the following extraordinary admissions: That he never read the "History of the Protestant Reformation in England"; that he did not know that Abbé Portal had been forbidden by Leo XIII ever to reopen the question of Anglican orders; and that he had not realized until the conference assembled that the Anglicans who had come to it had no official authorization from their Church. Cardinal Casquet said he could not forbear from telling him that he seemed strangely lacking in the necessary qualifications. . . .[4]

Confraternity of Unity

Since that time, there have been other ventures, such as the "Confraternity of Unity" (of four founders, three have become Catholics).[5] There is also a "Church Unity Octave Council" functioning and two periodicals, *viz.*, the *Pilot*, and *Reunion*. But, through a strange paradox, all these efforts seem to be directed towards keeping people *out* of the Church, making them wait for a delusive and vain phantom of formal corporate reunion. They hope to create a quasi-uniate Church which will retain most of the present features of Anglicanism, say, a married clergy, English liturgy, a sort of patriarchal autonomy as regards internal affairs (analogous to misunderstood features of Eastern Catholicity). For example, we note the following:

In regard to a detailed policy of reunion none has been formulated nor is yet possible. We hope that the Church of England with its ministry and organization may be brought back into Catholic unity. The only essentials to this unity are that the Pope's infallibility in matters of Faith and Morals be recognized and that he be accorded a general oversight in the life of the Church, which need mean no more than that he should intervene if anything went gravely wrong. . . . No doubt, if reunion came near there would be all kinds of bargaining, constitutional safeguards, recognition of traditional ways of life and adaptations to circumstances readily accorded by the Holy See. . . . We should probably remain much as we are in regard to our daily religion, but with the comforting knowledge that we should be protected from heresy. . . . If the people seemed to wish it no doubt the Holy Father would be content to see very little of us and leave us to our own devices . . . Our Lord declared that He committed His Church to the care of Peter, which the Catholic religion has ever taken to mean the care of the Apostolic See of Rome. We who have been forced away from that care have been given the grace to see that it is time we returned to it, not helter-skelter, but prudently and with regard to all the facts of the case."

The goal proposed is utterly impossible and patently ignores the facts of the case. It is to their advantage to enter the Church, hence there is no place for bargaining, constitutional safeguards or the like." As a matter of fact, if they have been given the grace to see that "it is time we return to it" then they would be responsible before God for the light given.

We have covered very briefly the historical facts of the corporate reunion movement in modern Anglicanism. Now we proceed to treat of the principal arguments used in the question.

Reasons for believing a formal corporate reunion is impossible

Nature of Anglicanism Itself

The very character of the Anglican communion itself militates against such a notion. Being "comprehensive" in its very essence, every individual member fashions for himself his own religion, as it were. Moreover, it is extremely unlikely that it will ever be other than what it is, in this respect; there is no party or power in it that can make it otherwise. An official of the Establishment declares:

"The Church of England" (as Bishop Gore once somewhat ruefully remarked) "is a tough old thing." Italianizing Anglo-Catholics, self-styled "modernists," and Kensitite Protestants are all (with varying

degrees of discomfort) *tolerated* in the Church of England, but no one of these various extremist groups has the least chance of ever capturing the Church as a whole. Those Christians . . . who can never be happy without unanimity on all points of doctrine or practice . . . will never find in the Church of England a comfortable Church to inhabit."

Even if we isolate the party called "Anglo-Catholic" for separate consideration, we will find the same to be true. To consider them as species of Catholics without the Pope is an error. Basically and essentially, they are Protestants, who, through private judgement have arrived at some approximation of Catholic doctrine, and, through liberal borrowings, have assumed a certain external resemblance to Catholic ritual. Needless to say, these act on their own judgement in opposition to their own religious ordinances and the will of their officials. This group is not an homogeneous whole. We find in this party "conservatives" who believe they form a true branch of the Church of Christ, the "modernists," the "liberals," the "Pro-Romans" or "Papalists." Each of these, which are only very rough classifications, mingle with various combinations in almost every parish. The "Pro-Romans" are the least in numbers and among them we find many divergencies as well e.g. the Pope is infallible in the Catholic sense, (but he was mistaken about Anglican orders) or, the Pope is infallible "with explanations" which dilutes the notion so as to mean nothing at all. Each group presumes to speak for the rest (and even for the whole Anglican communion) yet no one actually expresses other than his own private opinion. Where, then, is the possibility of a formal corporate reunion? Each individual has to seek his own way to the truth and make his own personal reconciliation with the Church when he is prepared to do so. Cardinal Manning said: "The Divine law is peremptory: 'To him who knoweth to do good, and doth it not, to him it is a sin.' Every Divine truth, as it shines upon us, lays its obligation on our consciences to believe and to obey it. When the Divine authority of the Church manifests itself to our intellect, it lays its jurisdiction on our conscience to submit to it."

Constitution of Anglicanism

On the other hand, the very constitution of the Anglican communion renders a formal corporate reunion impossible. In England, the King is at the head of the Establishment and appoints its officials (generally on the nomination of the Prime Minister). By the law

of the land, if the king becomes a Catholic (or even if he marries one) *ipso facto* he ceases to be king. If he is no longer king, he cannot act as head in the name of the Establishment. The Anglican communion itself is, like the British Commonwealth of Nations, a loosely bound fellowship of national bodies having a common loyalty and a form of government under a nominal president, the Primate of Canterbury. By definition, he has no jurisdiction over the rest of the officials, so *he* cannot act for the Anglican communion. Moreover, when the periodic Lambeth Conferences convene (the gathering of all the officials of the communion,) they assume only a consultative and advisory capacity with no authority over the constituent members; so *that* cannot act either. Within England itself, each parish is, more or less, a legal corporation, the incumbent, once inducted, is irremovable except by a costly legal proceeding. (That is why the "Ritualists" of the early part of this century and the late ninities could hold out against their ecclesiastical superiors who attacked them for "Romanizing" practices). So, no one can move another.

In the United States, the Episcopalian body is governed by a "house of bishops" and a "house of deputies" under a "presiding bishop." This presiding official has no authority over the rest; he has not even a diocese of his own. On the parish level, the clergyman is usually chosen by the congregation and he remains under the watchful eye of the lay churchwardens. The ultimate source authority is from the individual parishioners. Who, in this mass, is in a position of making a formal corporate reunion with the Holy See? Individual or group conversions can achieve the much desired reunion, but it will be corporate in a material sense only.

Confusion En Masse

Turning the argument around, even supposing that the Establishment and its daughters should desire formal corporate reunion with the Holy See and its officials were in a position to secure this, it would still be impossible. This time the impossibility would be on the part of the Church. Of course, everyone who is sufficiently instructed and makes the act of faith and abjuration of errors will be received; the more the better. But for a whole Protestant sect to acquiesce passively in being swept into the Church by the action of their leaders is inconceivable. The Church has too high a regard for the bonds of membership which she communicates to those converted to her; she has too great a respect for the dignity and intelligence involved in the freedom of the act of faith. Some suggestion of this may be found in these words of Pius XII:

> While We want this unceasing prayer to rise to God from the whole Mystical Body in common, that all the straying sheep may hasten to enter the one fold of Jesus Christ, yet We recognize that this step must come of their own free will; for no one believes unless he wills to believe. Hence they are most certainly not genuine Christians who, against their belief, are forced to go into a Church, to approach the altar and to receive the sacraments. . . . Therefore, whenever it happens, despite the invariable teaching of the Apostolic See, that anyone against his wi'l is compelled to embrace the Catholic Faith, Our sense of duty demands that we condemn the act."

Moreover, how could they be re-united corporately in a formal sense, who do not form a *corpus* in a formal sense, but merely a *mass*? They are a mass of individuals involved in congeries of contradictions and their ecclesiastical forms are but shadows of Catholic realities. Their Orders are not valid and there is no possibility of the question ever being opened again.

Some have avowed that, while they profess belief in Papal infallibility, they still hold that their orders are valid. They would be willing, though, to accept conditional reordination in order to satisfy the Holy See on the point. We have noted above that Pope Leo XIII's letter to the Archbishop of Paris, suppressing the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*, declared that the judgment on Anglican Orders was final and irrevocable, binding with interior assent upon all Catholics. The gesture of wishing to receive conditional re-ordination clearly indicates that they believe that the Church does not know what it is all about. He would be a very strange Catholic priest, who would deny a Papal judgment in the very act of becoming a priest. Moreover, even were the Anglican Orders valid, the sacraments would be of no profit to those who confected them in a state of formal schism.

Judgment of Credibility is not yet Faith

In any case, *if they have received the gift of the full Catholic Faith*, their situation is most grave and perilous. The words italicized are important, because it is very possible that many statements of these Anglican Papalists do not indicate the possession of full Divine Catholic Faith, but only the presence of strong motives of credibil-

ity; in which case, they are bound to study further and to follow generously where grace leads. On the other hand, they may be victims of an invincibly erroneous conscience with respect to their obligations and, here, the obligation becomes operative when they suspect its existence and the duty of further inquiry. Without presuming to enter the realm of internal dispositions, of which God alone is the Judge, these observations seem to be applicable. Converts from this school of thought assure us that they were perfectly sincere before God, even though their position was objectively and logically untenable to our eyes and to their own eyes as well after they received light to see the true situation.[28] But, when handling the subject of formal corporate reunion, firmness and definiteness is the surest charity; true charity does not countenance the cultivation of delusions.[29]

Some reasons frequently urged in favor of formal coroporate reunion:

It would be impossible to set forth all the possible reasons which have been urged, at one time or another, in favor of a formal corporate reunion of the Anglican communion with the Holy See. We have selected those which have had the greatest influence in keeping people outside the Church, who have given every indication that they should have entered it.

Argument from Authority

First, there is the argument from authority. It seems that weight was given to this notion in a private letter written to Lord Halifax by the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla: "... first allow me to tell you that it is not correct that at Rome we confine ourselves to the desire for individual conversions. The truth is only that we do not want individual conversion, the success of which is more immediate and easier, to be hindered while corporate reunion is being considered. ..."[30] The background of these words and their immediate context would disabuse one of any illusions in this respect. We have already noted the misleading picture of the state of the English Establishment that was innocently given to Pope Leo XIII by the *Abbé* Portal. The hour of the great return seemed almost at hand. An essential factor, before all else, was the consideration of the validity of Anglican orders. These were finally declared invalid on the basis of facts both theological and historical. While

the investigation on the subject was going on, Lord Halifax wrote to Cardinal Rampolla inquiring as to the truth of the rumor that the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was ordered to cease publication. If it were true, he would cease campaigning for formal corporate reunion (since that was the main theme of the periodical)." The Cardinal informed him, as quoted above, but continues: "... It is not correct to suppose that the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* has been condemned; this has not taken place, and will not take place, if its editors are really on guard and do not anticipate the judgment of the Holy Father on questions whose solution he has reserved to himself. ..."[31]

That letter is dated August 24, 1896. On September 13 of the same year, the Bull, *Apostolicae curae*, was published. On November 5 of the same year the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* was ordered to cease publication. In that document, as we have noted, it was declared that to favor the designs of the Anglicans was to place no small obstacle in the way of the progress of religion. In a rapid sequence of events, another project fell through. But it should be noted that, while the Cardinal's words seemed to tell for the case of formal corporate reunion *in the abstract* before the decision was arrived at, yet he does say that individual conversions should not be hindered in the meanwhile. However, what would the Cardinal have said if he read this:

> Those Anglicans who accept the Catholic Faith in its fullness and "believe that the See of Rome is the center of unity for all Churches" should not secede to the Roman Church, but, remaining at their posts, should work for the reunion of the whole ecclesiastical body with the Holy See. ... Its realization, however, requires patience, for it may take many generations to accomplish. ... the *time* that such a task consumes is immaterial; the *quality* of the work is of immense importance. As one generation passes away, another will enter into its labors.[32]

To give countenance to such a notion would be to encourage formal schism. With full knowledge of the facts, one is urged to remain separated from the Church. Cardinal Newman wrote to deLisle:

> You know enough of my feelings on the whole subject that there are some things in it, in which I am afraid to follow you ... I mean ... that the tendency of a portion of your pamphlet is ... to persuade individual Anglicans to wait out of communion with the Catholic Church, till they can come over with others in a body. There is such

an extreme difficulty in rousing the mind to the real *necessity* of leaving the position into which men have grown up . . . that they will easily avail themselves of any slightest excuse—and even a hint from a person so deeply respected as yourself . . . is more than sufficient to turn the scale, when the mind is in suspense. . . . they have individual souls, and with what heart can I do anything to induce them to preach to others, if they themselves thereby become castaways. . . ."

Fear of Private Judgment

The next argument, expressed in favor of formal corporate reunion, is the fear of private judgment. Cardinal Newman, as an Anglican, dissuaded a person from entering the Church on this ground:

I am not surprised at anyone being drawn to the Roman Church under your feelings, wrong as I think it . . . So great a matter as a change of religion ought not to be thought of without years (I may say) of prayer and preparation. Nor do I think it God's way, generally speaking, for *individuals* to leave one religion for another,—it is so much like an exercise of private judgment. Three thousand *at once* were converted on the day of Pentecost. Where *miracles* are brought before an individual the case is different. . . ."

Cardinal Newman, as a Catholic, in effect, answers himself:

You ask me whether you cannot now continue what you were. . . . In the beginning of the movement you disowned private judgment, but now, if you would remain a party, you must, with whatever inconsistency, profess it; . . . You will no longer be Anglo-Catholic, but Patristico-Protestant. You will be obliged to frame a religion for yourselves, and then to maintain that it is the very truth, pure and celestial, which the Apostles promulgated. . . ."

This argument is not so much urged by the Pro-Roman group as by the conservative group of "Anglo-Catholics" so no further treatment is necessary.

Opportunity for Doing Good

Another species of argument for corporate reunion has to do with the Establishment itself: if they leave it, it will be lost to other forces; if they remain in it, they will stand a chance of improving it, doctrinally, ritually, spiritually, preparing it for reunion with Rome. For example:

The Confraternity would at all times discourage individual secessions to Rome . . . for were secessions, either to Rome or to the East, to become too numerous, the Anglo-Catholic movement would come to an end, and this whole communion be lost to Protestantism. The Confraternity would, with even greater emphasis, discourage any movement that might lead to a schism within the Anglican communion itself and the return of a part only to union with Rome. It is for the return of the whole body that the Confraternity is working and this is the ideal for which the Confraternity stands."

Newman's answer to such a position was:

. . . Seek those principles in their true home. If your Church rejects your principles, it rejects you; nor dream of indoctrinating it with them by remaining; . . . You cannot change your Establishment into a Church without a miracle. It is what it is and you have no means of acting upon it . . . while you are one with it. . . . If you would make England Catholic, you must go forth on your mission *from* the Catholic Church. You *have* duties towards the Establishment; it is the duty, not of owning its rule, but of converting its members. Oh My brethren! life is short, waste it not in vanities; dream not; halt not between two opinions; wake from a dream in which you are not profiting your neighbor, but imperilling your own souls."

He said those words about one hundred years ago (1850). They are still true today; the party has, indeed, extended its numbers, but it has also divided itself into various schools; the Establishment is no more "Catholic" now than it was then, but is even more comprehensive.

Spiritual Life

The final species of argument in favor of formal corporate reunion has reference to the spiritual life of the individual. It is argued: if one should become a Catholic, he must deny the very existence of a spiritual life up to the time of his conversion. But this would be a lie, for the person in question is conscious of having pursued perfection and has some definite evidence of progress in this regard. Moreover, he can point to other good Anglicans who have attained great degrees of virtue. By corporate reunion alone, it is asserted, can one safeguard his recognition of these facts. One writer (who, though of the "Anglo-Catholic" party is not immediately concerned with the problem) puts it in this fashion:

He (i.e. the seceder) is, indeed, more pitied now than criticized,

as one who has become blinded by the dazzling magnificence of Rome to the Catholic character of the Anglican communion. In those days, however, a priest was called upon to witness, by secession, to the fact that the Anglican communion was in schism and partial heresy only; whereas now he must subscribe to a bewildering condemnation of the validity of his orders, and erase by a mental sponge, those deep and rich sacramental experiences which are, by the cumulative witness of innumerable Churchmen, *objectively* true (or else nought is true, and truth but a will-o-the-wisp)."

No one, on becoming a Catholic, is called upon to deny any grace he has received. To hold that eminent virtue (which we do recognize in many Anglicans in good faith) can be attained without grace is Pelagian; to deny that they receive grace is Jansenistic. The Holy Office instruction of December 20, 1949 declares: "Non-Catholics may certainly be told that, in returning to the Church, they will forfeit none of the good that the grace of God has hitherto wrought in their souls, but that the return will bring this to its perfection and final consummation."[34] Cardinal Manning notes:

1. That in denying the Church of England to be the Catholic Church, or any part of it, or in any divine and true sense a Church at all, and in denying the validity of its absolutions and its orders, no Catholic ever denies the workings of the Spirit of God or the operations of grace in it. 2. That in affirming the workings of grace in the Church of England no Catholic ever thereby affirms that it possesses the character of a Church. . . . Never have I allowed anyone who has come to me for guidance or instruction to harbor a doubt of the past workings of grace in them. It would be not only a sin of ingratitude, but a sin against the truth.[35]

But it is quite another thing to say that they receive this grace through the ritual ordinances of their communion. To make the cumulation of sensible experiences, over against historical and theological evidence, the criterion of truth is virtually to profess Modernism. Cardinal Newman said:

You tell me, my brethren, that you have the clear evidence of the influences of grace in your hearts, by its effects sensible at the moment and permanent in the event. . . . and I am not the person, my dear brethren, to quarrel with the truth of what you say. . . . nor am I so ungrateful to God's former mercies to myself, to have the heart to deny them in you. . . . Your fault has been to be satisfied with but a half evidence of your safety; you have been too contented with remaining where you found yourselves, not to catch at a line of argument, so indulgent, yet so plausible. . . . Learn to fear

for your souls. It is something to be peaceful within, but it is not everything. It may be the stillness of death. The Catholic, and he alone, has within him that union of external with internal notes of God's favor, which sheds the light of conviction over his soul, and makes him both fearless in his faith and calm and thankful in his hope."[36]

Trouble Involved

In a speech in London on July 14, 1896, the *Abbé* Portal declared:

Our fundamental principle is the principle of authority; moreover, this method of corporate reunion is more in conformity with the principle, because it saves the individual from the torture of doubt, and other risks incurred by a personal investigation of the faith. You say to a soul which by its past, its education, and the graces it has received is bound by all the cords of its being to this or that Church —you say to such a soul, You are in error, and outside the true fold. Who does not see the danger of shaking of the whole roots of the spiritual life?[37]

This is certainly a *reductio ad absurdum* of all the arguments for formal corporate reunion. It is a virtual denial of the ecumenical mission of the Church of Christ and of the obligation of every soul to be in communion with it.

The Anglicans (even the "Anglo-Catholics") do not recognize the principle of authority nor act on it, but rather, the principle of private judgment.[38] Moreover, from the Catholic side, it is a denial of the principle of authority itself to encourage souls whom God calls to membership in His Church to remain in schism and material heresy until they can accomplish His will without any trouble to themselves.

Personal investigation of the Faith is an obligation which becomes operative the moment a person becomes aware of his position. This investigation is necessary in order that one obtain the gift of faith and no one may lawfully be swept into the Church in a mass movement unless he knows all that is involved in the act of faith and is prepared to assume freely all the obligations that go with membership in the Church.[39] This may well involve the cross of foregoing lesser goods in view of obtaining the greater. Attachments which are civil, economic, cultural or social are undoubtedly strong, but they must take a secondary position to the will of God clearly seen. No human authority can relieve them of this obligation. The cords which bind them to their present position are human only; it is not true

to say that any grace binds them thus. Every grace that they have received has been given in view of their conversion to the one Church of Christ. The spiritual life is the life of grace and cooperation with grace, for the most part. Newman said:

> . . . all we know is, that the grace given them is intended ultimately to bring them into the Church, and if it is not tending to do so, it will not ultimately profit them. . . . There is one set of persons in whom every Catholic must feel intense interest, about whom he must feel the gravest apprehensions; *viz.*, those who have some rays of light vouchsafed to them as to their heresy or as to their schism, and who seem to be closing their eyes upon it; or those who have actually gained a clear view of the nothingness of their own communion, and the reality and divinity of the Catholic Church, yet delay to act upon their knowledge. You, my dear brethren, if such are here present, are in a very different state from those around you. You are called by the inscrutable grace of God to the possession of a great benefit, and to refuse the benefit is to lose the grace. You cannot be as the others . . . They have not yet had the call to inquire, to seek . . . and they will be judged according to what is given them, not by what is not. But on you the thought has dawned, that possibly Catholicism may be true; you have doubted the safety of your present position . . . dare not to fall short of God's grace, or to lag behind when that grace goes forward. Walk with it, cooperate with it, and I know how it will end. . . .[7]

The primary consideration is eternal salvation.[8] No sacrifice can be too great to achieve this benefit when the relationship between eternal salvation and membership in the Church is perceived. Pope Leo XIII confirms this:

> If those about to come back to their most loving Mother (not yet fully known, or culpably abandoned) should perceive that their return involves not indeed the shedding of their blood (at which price nevertheless the Church was bought by Jesus Christ) but some lesser trouble and labor, let them clearly understand that this burden has been laid on them not by the will of man but by the will and command of God.[9]

The ultimate resolution of the problem of reunion

With these words we conclude our consideration of the manner of reunion. The ultimate resolution of the problem of the reunion of Christendom is the conscience of every individual soul with respect to its response to grace. This cannot be delegated to another or to the group of which he is a member. He is a being endowed with

intelligence and free-will and is consequently responsible to God for his personal decisions. It is the great adventure of life to discover truth and to embrace it at whatever cost. Precipitant action, of course, should be avoided; much prayer and study should precede and accompany every grave decision. But once the issues are perceived in terms of truth and error, right and wrong, divine call and human bonds, eternal life may well hang in the balance. Every individual must decide for himself before God the course of action which he will pursue. To all the separated world, Pope Leo XIII addressed these words, which are the dynamic motivation of Catholic Ecumenism:

> Suffer that We should invite you to the unity which has ever existed in the Catholic Church and can never fail; suffer that We should lovingly hold out Our hand to you. The Church, as the common Mother of all, has long been calling you back to her; the Catholics of the world await you with brotherly love, that you may render holy worship to God together with us, united in perfect charity by the profession of one Gospel, one faith and one hope.[10]

NOTES

[1] A.C. Headlam, *The doctrine of the Church and Christian reunion* (New York: Longmans, 1920) p. 108.

[2] St. Cyprian, *Epistola* 43, 5 in: M. J. Rouet De Journal, *Enchiridion Patristicum* (Barcelona: Herder, 1946) n. 573: "Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui et sacerdotium novum fieri praeter unum altare et unum sacerdotium non potest. Quisque alibi collegerit, spargit."

[3] As an Anglican, John Henry Newman wrote: "Christianity has been long enough in the world to justify us in dealing with it as a fact in the world's history. . . . Bold outlines, which cannot be disregarded, rise out of the records of the past . . . Whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth, it is this." *An essay on the development of Christian Doctrine* (New York: Appleton, 1846) pp. 11, 12 (**First edition**).

[4] W.T. Manning: Kenneth D. Mackenzie, (ed.) *Union of Christendom* 2 vols (London: Religious Book Club, 1938) I, pp. 25-26.

[5] The phrase, "of which all baptized Christians . . . are already members" calls for comment. In the first place, an *infant* who is baptized validly (i.e. correct matter, form and intention of doing what the Church does) by any minister whatsoever is made a member of the Church, because objectively baptism is a profession of the Faith of Christ, sacramental initiation, and a manifestation of the will to subject oneself to lawful pastors. Upon attaining the age of reason, an implicit revocation of the bonds of membership takes place when, by his own free acts he becomes associated with some sect or is not publicly associated with the Church; even though this does not imply a formal sin on his part, he is no longer a *member* of the Church. He

remains, though a *subject* of the Church with the objective obligation of returning to membership. In the internal forum, if he retains the state of sanctifying grace, he retains a relationship with the Church by implicit intention, if invincible ignorance is present. On the other hand, if an *adult* is baptized validly in a non-Catholic sect with the proper dispositions and if his heresy or schism is material only, conjoined to invincible ignorance, he receives the character and the grace, but he does not become a *member* of the Church thereby; he remains, though, a *subject* of the Church and, in the internal forum, if he has the state of sanctifying grace, he is linked to the Church by reason of implicit intention and baptismal character. Moreover, the objective obligation of returning to the Church ever abides. Membership in any society is a visible and tangible reality, and, in the case of the Church of Christ, it involves, as an essential factor, union with the Holy See.

[6] Holy . . . , *Quod cos, Acta Sanctae Sedis* II, 667; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longmans, Green, 1867) p. 229.

[7] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* XX, 15-16; Eng.tr.: *The Promotion of True Religious Unity* (Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C. 1928) pp. 16-17.

[8] Holy Office, *Quod cos, ASS* II, 667; Eng. tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom, op. cit.*, p. 240.

[9] Pius IX, *Iam vos omnes, Acta et decreta sacrosanctae oecumenici concilii Vaticani* (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1892) Eng. tr.: David Lewis ed., *The year of preparation for the Vatican Council* (London: Burns, Oates, 1869) p. 57.

[10] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis, AAS*, XXXV, 243; Eng. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ*, (New York: America Press, 1943) p. 44.

[11] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Leonis Papae XIII allocutiones epistolae, constitutiones, aliaque acta praecipua* (Bruges: Desclee de Brouwer, 1900) V. 276; Eng. tr.: "The Reunion of Christendom," *Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1903) p. 308.

[12] For further details see: Adrian Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1929) pp. 83-86 .

[13] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones, op. cit.*, VI, 181; Holy Office, *Quod cos, ASS* II, 667.

[14] "Prima salus est rectae fidei regulam custodire et a constitutis Patrum nullatenus deviare. Et quia non potest Domini Nostri Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: 'Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam' etc. (Mt. 16:18) Haec, quae dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus. quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio. De qua spe et fide minime separari cupientes et Patrum sequentes constituta, anathematizamus omnes haereses, . . . sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam Sedem, et praedicantes eius omnia constituta. Et ideo spero, ut in una communione vobiscum, quam Sedes Apostolica praedicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax Christianae religionis et perfecta soliditas: promittens in sequenti tempore sequestratos a communione Ecclesiae catholicae, id est non consentientes Sedi Apostolicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria. Quodsi in aliquo a professione mea deviare tentavero, his, quos damnavi, complicem me mea sententia esse profiteor. Hanc autem professionem meam ego manu subscripsi, et tibi Hormisdae sancto ac venerabili Papae urbis Romae direxi." Henricus Denziger, (ed.), (Friburgi Brisgoviae: Herder, 1937) no. 171-172.

[15] *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Westminster, Md.: Newman Book Shop, 1944) can. 1350; English paraphrase: Stanislaus Woywod, *A practical commentary on the Code of Canon Law* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1939) I, 106-107.

[16] For procedure in this matter consult: Joseph G. Coodwine, *The reception of converts*, (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1944).

[17] John Henry Newman, *Parochial and plain sermons* (London: Rivingtons, 1875) III, 91.

[18] John Henry Newman, *Apologia pro vita sua* (New York: Oxford University Press) p. 280.

[19] Holy Office, *Quod cos*, ASS II, 662; Eng. tr.: Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 236-237.

[20] Charles Butler, *Historical memoirs of the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics since the Reformation* (London: John Murray, 1822) III, 197.

[21] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS XX, 10; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 8.

[22] *Lambeth Occasional Reports* 1931-8 (London: S.P.C.K., 1948) p. 27.

[23] ". . . episcopalem vestram et sollicitudinem et vigilantiam excitatam volumus, ut, quantum potestis contendere, opinionem illam impiam aeque funestam ab hominum mente propulsetis, nimirum quavis in religione reperiri posse aeternae salutis viam." Pius IX, "Singulari quadam,": Henricus Denziger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, op. cit.*, no. 1646.

[24] W.A. Brown, *Christian unity: its principles and possibilities*, (New York: Association Press, 1921) p. 194.

[25] C.K.A. Bell ed., *Documents of Christian Unity; third series* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949) no. 197.

[26] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS XX, 13; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 13.

[27] C.D. Boardman in: A.H. Bradford ed., *Christ and the Church* (New York: Revell, 1895) p. 157-158.

[28] W.T. Manning, *The Call to unity* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) p. 68.

[29] An example of liberalist comprehension: "Exact theological agreement as a basis of church unity is already a failure. . . . Such agreements can never exist, so long as human nature is diverse in its temperament and many related truths are parodoxical in our logic. . . . Never fear for our common orthodoxy, while special orthodoxies take care of themselves in the march of knowledge and under the laws of thought." C.W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States* (New York: Schribners, 1895) p. 89. An example of modernist comprehension: "Instead of following Newman in his 'Grammar of Assent' let us follow him in 'Lead kindly light.' Indeed the hymns of the Church constitute the expressions of her faith infinitely better than the creeds of her councils. We are searching for the Faith which is greater than belief, as the symbol and bond of unity. . . . We too often obscure the deeper realities when we apply intellectual words to spiritual things. But, perhaps, after we have united with the disciples and among ourselves with the Master in washing one another's feet long enough, we shall find some common symbol that will express our faith and one which may be spoken in simple language and in many forms by our poor feeble minds." Charles S. MacFarland, *Christian unity in practice and prophecy* (New York: Macmillan, 1933) p. 159.

[30] Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, AAS XX, 12; Eng. tr.: *The promotion of true religious unity, op. cit.*, p. 11.

[31] "Sanctissime pater, domine et pastor supreme Ecclesiae Christi . . . Rep-

etentes in memoria consensum in omnibus atque unionem Orientalis et Occidentalis Ecclesiae, quam majores nostri sub oboedientia et regimine sanctae sedis Apostolicae Romanae coluerunt . . . deprecabamurque assidue Dominum, ut nos . . . in unitatem fidei aggregaret . . . ut vinculo hujus unionis adstricti sub oboedientia atque regimine sanctitatis vestrae, uno ore et corde glorificemus et laudemus omnes divinissimum et sanctissimum nomen Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti . . ." Quoted in: Thomas a Jesu, "De unione schismaticorum," *Theologia cursus completus* (Paris: Migne, 1840) V, 507.

[48] F.T. Furey, *Life of Leo XIII* (New York: Catholic Educational Company, 1903) p. 464.

[49] David Cannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor* (New York: Macmillan, 1951) p. 156, 158.

[50] Pius IX, *Acta et decreta*, *op. cit.*, col. 7.

[51] ". . . Juxta haec hortamur vos atque obtestamur, ut absque ulteriori mora redeatis ad communionem Sanctae hujus Petri Sedis, in qua verae Christi Ecclesiae fundamentum esse, et majorum vestrorum aliorumque veterum Patrum traditio, et quae antea commemoravimus Christi Domini verba in Sanctis Evangeliis relata demonstrant: . . . Itaque non aliud vobis imponimus oneris, quam haec necessaria; nimirum ut ad unitatem reversi consentiatis Nobiscum in professione verae Fidei, quam Ecclesia Catholica tenet ac docet, et cum Ecclesia ipsa, supremamque hac Petri Sede communionem servetis. Hinc ad vestros sacros ritus quod attinet, rejicienda solummodo erunt si quae in illos separationis tempore irrepserint, quae eidem Fidei et unitati Catholicae adversentur: atque his demptis sarte tectaeque vobis manebunt veteres liturgiae vestrae orientales; . . . Insuper deliberatus fixumque Nobis est, ut erga sacros Ministros, sacerdotes et Praesules, qui ex istis Nationibus ad unitatem Catholicam revertantur, eamdem, teneamus rationem, qua Decessores Nostri tum proximae tum superioris aetatis multoties usi sunt; ut illis scilicet servamus gradus, et dignitates suas; . . . Denique tum ipsos tum laicos, qui ad communionem Nostram redierunt, eadem qua caeteros Orientis Catholicos benevolentia complectemur. . . ." Pius IX, *In Supreme Petri, Pius IX Pontificis Maximi Acta* (Roma: Tipographia Bonarum Artium, 1855) I, 89, 90.

[52] See A. Palmieri, *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, (Florence: Libreria Editrice Florentina, 1913) II, 190.

[53] See Martin Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica dissidentium* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1931) I, 24-26.

[54] Of interest here is the "Memorandum" submitted by Vladimir Soloviev to Pope Leo XIII in which he pointed out: "It is an established fact that the opinions of our Oriental theologians, which are more or less contrary to the Catholic truth, in general are not proclaimed as infallible or obligatory dogmas by these theologians themselves, nor are they accepted as such by the faithful, nor do they have the same value as the decisions of the ecumenical councils; consequently, it is quite evident that one cannot justly place the responsibility for the anti-Catholic teachings of our theologians on the Oriental Church, as a body, since she never gave these doctrines her definitive sanction. . . . As for the masses of the faithful of the Oriental Church, one cannot accuse them of any definite error, seeing that their faith is the same as the Catholic Faith save for their ignorance of a few doctrinal definitions . . . determined in the West after the separation was accomplished . . ." cf. Stephen C. Gulovich, *Windows Westward* (New York: Declan X. McMullen, 1947) p. 116-117.

[55] "The solutions given by this magisterium constitute real dogmas which oblige acceptance on the part of all the faithful of the Catholic Church

and which she cannot alter and which she never will alter. Such, for instance, are the dogmas of the primacy of jurisdiction by Divine Right and the personal infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter; the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son, or from the Father through the Son, as from one sole principle; the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (etc.) . . . No more discussion is possible among us on any of these points. They are determined for all time and whoever wishes to belong to the fold of the successor of Peter must accept them." Martin Jugie, "Will union be easy for the Orientals?" in: *Unitas* vol. I (English language edition) no. 1 (January-March 1949) p. 46.

[56] Mar Severios, "The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India" in: *Unitas* vol. II (English language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1950) p. 205. Another reason for caution: "Protestant doctrines are finding their way more and more into the Orthodox seminaries, partly through the professors who, in many cases, have graduated in the Universities in England or Germany, and partly through the manuals used. Every day the indications of Protestant influence become more and more noticeable. Both Modernism and Rationalism have many supporters among the professors, and the teaching is no longer in full harmony with Orthodox traditions." Pere Janin, *The Separated Eastern Churches*, Tr. P. Boylan (London: Sands, 1933) pp. 28-29.

[57] Cf. Mar Severios, "The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India" in *Unitas* vol. II (English Language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1950) p. 201-206 and Mar Ivanios, "A new branch of the Tree of Life: The Syro-Malankara Church" in: Donald Attwater ed., *The Eastern Branches of the Catholic Church* (New York: Longmans Green, 1938) pp. 27-55.

[58] Pius IX, *Acta et decreta*, *op. cit.*, col. 8.

[59] Referring to a tentative between Lutherans and Catholics in the seventeenth century, one writer observes: "Such was the end of the numberless plans of Church union set on foot by the sovereigns of Germany during the course of the seventeenth century. For the immediate object for which they were designed by their originators, they proved utterly ineffective . . . But beyond individual conversions . . . history does not point to any single memorable result of all these ostentatious preparations. . . . the history of the Church furnishes no lesson so significant of the hopelessness of all such general movements, and of the folly of an individual member of any Church, when once convinced of the necessity of communion with the great Catholic body, perilling his private and personal happiness on the more than problematical expectation of an approximation of the Churches themselves, and bartering his own yearning desire of peace and rest within the bosom of the common Mother, for the brilliant but illusive prospect of enjoying that happiness in the restoration of his Church to the privileges of Catholic unity." Charles William Russell in: Godfrey William von Leibnitz, *A System of Theology*, tr. Russell (London: Burns and Lambert, 1850) pp. cxxiii-cxxiv.

[60] H. Paul Douglass, *Church Unity Movements in the United States*, (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934) p. 188.

[61] One Anglican writer expresses it as follows: "The behaviour of the governments of Eastern Europe in the face of Catholic opposition to Communism provides an enlightening gloss on the religious history of our own country, and might almost have been inspired by a study of English history. The rulers of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, determined to bring everything including the Church within their power, have decided upon a common policy. Before much can be done to subdue and stultify the Church the vital link between the local Sees and the Apostolic See in Rome must

be broken. . . ." Church Unity Octave Council, *Annual Call for the Church Unity Octave* (London: C.U.O., 1950) p. 1.

Another Anglican reports the origin of the Elizabethan hierarchy: "The Anglican hierarchy, far unlike its rival, was a child of convulsion and compromise: it drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The Church of England was a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk; it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular system had been fed; and the life of it, as an independent and corporate existence, was gone forever. But it had been taken up and grafted upon the State. If not what it had been, it could retain the form of what it had been—the form which made it respectable, without the power which made it dangerous. The image, in its outward aspect, could be made to correspond with the parent tree; and to sustain the illusion, it was necessary to provide bishops who could appear to have inherited their powers by the approved method, as successors of the apostles." James Anthony Froude, *History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1870) VII, 178-179.

[2] R.W. Church, *The Oxford Movement; twelve years* 1833-1845 (London: Macmillan, 1892) p. 239-240.

[3] John Henry Newman, *Letters and Correspondence* (London: Longmans, 1903) II, 258.

[4] *Ibid.*, II, 285.

[5] Writing to J.R. Bloxam: "I do not suppose that there is a single member of our communion, of any religious feeling, but would, *abstractly*, wish a reunion between them and us; but what we are all deeply impressed with, for one reason or another is its hopelessness. . . ." Quoted by: R.D. Middleton, *Newman and Bloxam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947) p. 122.

[6] Writing to Ambrose Phillips de Lisle: "I find it very difficult to realize such an idea as a fact. As a Protestant, I never could get myself to entertain it as such, nor have I been able as a Catholic." Quoted by: Wilfrid Ward, *Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (London: Longmans, 1913) II, 115.

[7] Quoted by: John Edward Bowden, *The Life and Letters of Frederick William Faber* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1869) p. 197 (Italics in the original.)

[8] See Shane Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning; his life and labors* (New York: P.J. Kenedy, 1921) p. 176.

[9] Holy Office, *Quod vos*, ASS II, 667; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

[10] Holy Office, *Apostolici Sedi*, ASS II, 660; Eng. tr.: Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

[11] Leo XIII, *Anuntissimae celatatis*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, *op. cit.*, VI, 44; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

[12] Leo XIII, *Apostolicae curae*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, *op. cit.*, VI, 209; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters*, *op. cit.*, 405-406.

[13] ". . . sententiam Nostram nemo prudens rectoque animatus compellere in dubitationem posset, catholici autem omnes summo deberent obsequio amplecti, tamquam perpetuo firmam, ratam, irrevocabilem. . . . quando ex Anglis dissidentibus ii certi homines qui veritatem rei de ordinationibus suis exquirere a Nobis sincero animo videbantur, veritatem ipsam a Nobis coram Deo significatam, animo longe alio acceperunt, plane consequitur ut catholici . . . agnoscant officium suum. Iam nunc enim nec aequum fuerit nec decorum sibi, illorum hominum adiungi et quoquo modo suffragari consilio; quod

etiam optato religionis incremento possit non minime abesse." *Religionis apud Anglos*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, *op. cit.*, VI, 225-226.

Anglicanism does not understand the Catholic notion of the Sacrament of Holy Orders or Apostolic Succession. In the Chicago-Lambeth "Quadrilateral" containing conditions of reunion, the phrase, "Historic Episcopate" is used to designate one of the essential factors in the "re-united Church." This has been a constant feature in the reunion schemes or ventures entered upon since the Lambeth Conference of 1888. What does it mean? Two Anglican writers contemporary with the original fashioning of this scheme, report as follows: "The phrase "Historic Episcopate" was substituted for the old phrase, "Apostolic Succession" in the bishops' articles of reunion, and the emphasis was thereby transferred from a private opinion to a universal truth. The Historic Episcopate means effective Christian leadership. When we get it we will not need to dispute about the grace of orders." George Hodges in: A.H. Bradford, ed., *Christ and the Church*, *op. cit.*, p. 230. Another writer declares: "It will be seen that I use that happily chosen phrase, "the historic episcopate" in its literal meaning. . . . Episcopalians of all schools, except such as deny it outright, find in it the episcopate, but rate it variously in a scale somewhere between zero and infinity." C.W. Shields, *The United Church of the United States*, *op. cit.*, p. 182. In the Lambeth Conference of 1930 we read the same "comprehensive" view: ". . . But while we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as a necessary element in any union . . . we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union." C.K.A. Bell, *Documents of Christian Unity*, *op. cit.*, n. 146.

[14] For example: ". . . At present men cannot see the Church because it is not one; and we must never rest until they can see it because it has become one." Spencer Jones, *England and the Holy See* (London: Longmans, Green 1902) p. 83-84.

[15] David Gannon, *Father Paul of Graymoor*, *op. cit.*, p. 98-103.

[16] Paul James Francis in: C.H. Curtis, ed., *Beyond the Road to Rome* (St. Louis: Herder, 1914) p. 216.

[17] William Francis Brown, *Through windows of memory* (London: Sands, 1946) p. 84-85.

[18] T. Bowyer Campbell, "Towards the Chair of Peter" in: *Unitas* vol. I (English Language edition) no. 3 (July-September 1949) pp. 3-16.

[19] Church Unity Octave Council, *Annual Call of the Church Unity Octave* (London: C.U.O., 1950) p. 3.

[20] "If the Roman Communion is to be identified with the Catholic Church, one who believes in the Catholic Church must seek admission with no regard to terms. To believe in the Church is to trust it to know what is right. Unconditional surrender alone is possible. My attitude for a long time was that of an approving critic: I knew that if conversion came, it must be that of a penitent sinner." Francis Joseph Kinsman, *Salve Mater* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1920) p. 282. The author was Episcopalian "bishop" of Delaware.

[21] A.E.J. Rawlinson in: A.E.J. Rawlinson and Charles Smith, *The Genius of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1947) p. 17.

[22] Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom* (London: Longman, 1867) p. 99.

[23] Pius XII, *Mystici corporis*, AAS XXXV, 243; Engl. tr.: *The Mystical Body of Christ*, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[24] "I have often been asked, since my conversion, how, in view of them,

Anglican clergy can be sincere in remaining where they are. My reply has been—they *are* sincere. There is a state of mental blindness in which one is incapable of seeing the plain logic of facts. I only know that it was over a year before I acted on these facts myself. And I honestly believe that I was sincere during that period. Only those who have been Protestants can appreciate the thick veil of prejudice, fear and mistrust of 'Rome' which hampers every groping toward the truth." Owen Francis Dudley in: Stephen and Severin Lamping, eds., *Through Hundred Gates* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1941) p. 56.

[2] "It may seem a strange and invidious thing for us, who witness for the unity of the Church throughout the world to be tardy in going forth to meet those who approach us with invitations to union. . . . We should have to answer to the Good Shepherd, if so much as one of His sheep were frayed away from the fold by harsh voices or rough handling on our part. Charity, in all its forms and instincts, of patience, tenderness, forbearance, hopefulness, and gentleness is our duty as Pastors. But we owe them more than this. They have a right to the whole truth, and we are bound in duty to declare it to them." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 151, 154.

[3] As quoted by Bede Winslow in: *Report of the Proceedings of the Church Unity Octave held at Blackfriars, Oxford* . . . 1942 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1942) p. 34.

[4] Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders* (London: Longmans, 1912) p. 350-351.

[5] ". . . permettez-moi de vous dire qu'il n'est pas exact qu'à Rome on se borne à désirer des conversions individuelles, ne voulant pas l'union en corps: il est vrai seulment qu'on ne vent pas d'entraves aux conversions individuelles, dont le succès est plus proche et plus facile, tandis que l'on s'occupe de l'union en corps. On n'est pas dans le vrai non plus lorsqu'on suppose que la *Revue Anglo-Romaine* a été condamnée; ceci n'est pas arrivé, et n'arrivera pas, surtout si ses réducteurs veulent bien se tenir sur leurs gardes, et ne pas devancer le jugement du Saint-Père sur les questions dont il s'est réservé la solution. . . ." *Ibid.*, 351-352

[6] *Confraternity of Unity: a brief explanation of its aims and methods*, (Concord, N.H.: Rumford Press, 1930) p. 7, 10.

[7] Quoted in: E.S. Purcell, *Life and letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle*, (London: Macmillan, 1900) I, 368.

Note, likewise, the following observation: "For a person to plead that he or she does not consider that individual abandonment of a false position is desirable, but that individuals should wait and work for a great corporate movement, is to my thinking like a man who in ignorance had married a divorced woman, and on realizing that he had done wrong, while still living with her, agitates for a repeal of the divorce laws. . . . For any individual to try to educate the members of the Church to which he belongs to a belief in the Divine authority of the Papacy, while still remaining in a position which the logic of his arguments forces him to confess to be schismatical, must be judged, I think, by most sensible people to be placing precept before example, and to be undoing by the influence of his own life what he is trying to do by his words and to leave himself open to the retort, 'Physician heal thyself' . . ." B.W. Maturin, *The Price of Unity* (London: Longmans, 1912). p. 161-162.

[8] John Henry Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*, *op. cit.*, II, 310.

[9] John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans* (London: Longmans,

1897), I, 153. Writing to T.W. Allies, Newman said: ". . . I can't make out *how* you can be said to go by *authority*; and, if not, are not you, and all who do like you, only taking up a form of liberalism? . . ." See T.W. Allies, *A Life's Decision* (London: Burns, Oates, 1894) pp. 127-128.

[10] *Confraternity of Unity: a brief explanation of its aims and methods*, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[11] John Henry Newman. *Difficulties of Anglicans*, *op. cit.*, I, 165-166. Here is the way in which one contemporary official of the Establishment regards the "Pro-Roman" section of the High Church party: ". . . What are called Jesuits in disguise or crypto-Papists *may* (they suppose) capture key posts in the Anglican Church in order in the end to place it under the heel of the Pope. But such, on their own showing, are traitors and perjurers." C.K.A. Bell, *Christian unity: the Anglican position* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948) p. 58.

[12] Desmond Morse-Boycott, *The Secret story of the Oxford Movement* (London: Skeffington, 1933) p. 170.

[13] Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, AAS, XXXXII, 144; Eng. tr.: "The Ecumenical Movement" in: *Catholic Mind*, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

[14] Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 80-81, 95.

[15] John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, *op. cit.*, p. 80-81, 95.

[16] Quoted in: Viscount Halifax, *Leo XIII and Anglican Orders*, *op. cit.*, p. 335-336.

[17] "You are a body of yesterday; you are a drop in the ocean of professing Christians; yet you would give the law to priest and prophet; . . . you are more learned than Greece; you are purer than Rome; you know more than St. Bernard; you judge how far St. Thomas was right, and where he is to be read with caution, or held up to blame. . . ." John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, *op. cit.*, 157-158.

[18] "To receive the whole Council of Trent upon the principle of private judgment would make no man a Catholic. . . . We should not be submitting to them, but approving them. The formal motive of our approval would not be the Divine authority of the Council, but the judgment of our own private spirit." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[19] "God forbid . . . that minds be so brought within the unity of the Church. It would multiply our numbers, but not multiply the faithful. It would be to introduce among us a new and un-Catholic element, a show of material agreement disguising a formal and vital contrariety. Much as we desire to gather souls into the only Ark of salvation, we dare not do so at the sacrifice of truth. . . . They would be as St. Augustine says, '*intus corpore, corde foris*' . . ." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

[20] John Henry Newman, *Difficulties of Anglicans*, *op. cit.*, I, 84-85, 358-360.

[21] Newman wrote to T.W. Allies: ". . . persons like yourself should recollect that *the* reason *why* I left the Anglican Church was that I thought salvation was not to be found in it. . . . If it led me to leave Anglicanism, it necessarily led me, and leads me, to wish others to leave it. . . . Moreover, he (the convert) will feel most anxiously about those whom he has left in it, lest they should be receiving grace which ought to bring them into the Catholic Church, yet are in the way to quench it, and to sink into a state in which there is no hope. . . ." T.W. Allies, *A Life's Decision*, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

[22] Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*, *Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc.*, *op. cit.*,

VI, 156; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters, op. cit.*, p. 350-351.

[m] Leo XIII, *Praeclara gratulationis, Leonis Papae XIII Allocutiones etc., op. cit.*, V 279; Eng. tr.: *Great Encyclical Letters, op. cit.*, p. 311.

Summary and Conclusion

The contemporary movement towards world-wide unity is undoubtedly of Providential origin. Non-Catholics are re-discovering the fact that by the will and intention of Christ there should be but one Church throughout the world. The re-assessment of sectarianism, in both practise and principle, has brought to light the sinful origins of contemporary chaos in religion outside the Catholic Church. Some non-Catholics affirm, with varying degrees of contrition, that this condition is contrary to the will of Christ. Moreover, they affirm: "We all believe that the Chuch is God's gift to men for the salvation of the world; that the saving acts of God in Jesus Christ brought the Church into being; that the Church persists in continuity throughout history through the presence and the power of the Holy Spirit."[1]

Architecture of Divine Revelation

To this extent, at least, we may perceive certain operations of Divine Providence. These truths are implicit in the fragments of Christianity which they have retained. Catholic doctrine is an integral whole of which each part completes and illumines the rest. To reject any single truth is to distort the rest progressively to the point of complete disintegration. For example, the Reformers held the Catholic notion of the Incarnation, but rejected other truths of Catholic teaching, say, for instance, the doctrine of intrinsic justification. In the course of time, the clarity of the other truths were dimmed, so today we have a "christological agnosticism" current in contemporary protestantism. By a reverse procedure, under the light of divine grace, each several truth recovered calls for completion with the whole edifice of Catholic teaching. Otherwise that truth itself is clouded beyond recognition.

Figure in a Fog

The men at Amsterdam have envisioned, however dimly, the

one Church of Christ, but, in spite of the fact that it is a City set upon a hill visible to the world, they failed to recognize it. Prejudice and misinformation have clouded their vision. The declaration which we have cited has no theological or historical reference to any one of the component bodies, nor to the whole Council taken together; they admit this. But each one who assented to the declaration, beheld it in a different context with contradictory connotations. Some time before the Council, W.A. Visser't Hooft wrote: "What we have discovered is really that we do not know fully what the Church *is*, and that we must try to learn anew what is its nature and its function."[2]

Apparently they have not as yet arrived at what they set out to accomplish. However, if they sincerely work out to the logical conclusion the objective coment of their declaration, with the help of Divine Grace, they will not fail to reach a full recognition of the concrete, historical and corporate embodiment of the one Church of Christ and take steps to unite themselves with it—not as teachers and reformers, but as students and novices receiving a great benefit: Divine Catholic Faith, membership in the Body of Christ and possession of essential means to eternal salvation.

What We Have Attempted To Do

In the course of this dissertation, we have sought to set forth the principles of Catholic Ecumenism from authoritative sources. We have grouped these declarations in relation to the various phases logically involved in the consideration of the reunion of Christendom. We have likewise interspersed the whole with statements from Protestant Ecumenists by way of comparison with Catholic teaching.

From the examination of the factors involved in the reunion of Christendom we have determined upon three basic phases which underlie the whole question:

First Question: What is the Precise Aim?

The first phase to which Catholic Ecumenism directs its studies is to ascertain the *goal* of reunion. Although this may be the last in the order of actual execution, yet it is the first in the order of intention. Real progress is movement towards a specific terminus. Now, the specific terminus of the reunion of Christendom is not of man's election, but of God's ordinance; it is not a question of polling

agreements and differences, but of ascertaining the Divine Mind and Will. No new public revelation will be given, for its present content is objectively complete and immutable. What is sought for must already exist and be relatively easy to discover with complete certainty and objective assurance of Divine sanction.

The most evident fact to be gleaned from this consideration is the *unicity* of the Church; few call this into question. Immediately derived from this is its indefectible, perpetual and *perfect unity*. As a religious society, Divine in origin and support, Divine in authority and life; this one Church must enjoy such unity. Otherwise one would have to say that the promises of Christ were in vain or that the means He chose were inadequate to His purpose, which, of course, is ridiculous to one who believes Him to be the Incarnate Son of God.

Moreover, this unity, although completely supernatural by reason of the perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost and the Headship of Christ, since it is composed of men must express itself visibly through intellectual and moral bonds (i.e. unanimous consent to the whole body of revelation motivated by the truthfulness of God, and the social collaboration of its members in charity and obedience to leaders equipped with Divine authority). In other words, there must be unity of faith and government.

Finally, an examination of history and revelation discovers that this one visible religious society, founded by Christ, possesses historical continuity in one body, *in communion with the Holy See*, called by its own members as well as by its enemies, the Catholic Church. This one Church alone is both *de jure* and *de facto* ecumenical, because it alone was commissioned by Christ to make disciples of all nations and because it has, in fact, spread throughout the world perpetually preserving its historical identity for some twenty centuries. Hence, communion with this one Church is properly the goal of the reunion of Christendom on the part of those who are separated from it.

Second Question: Where Do We Start From?

The second phase in the reunion of Christendom is the determination of the point of departure. If reunion of Christendom is seen as a movement towards a goal, then one must ascertain his present position with respect to that goal. In aid of this, he must consider whether he is in actual possession of this Divinely-given unity or

not. Now, if he is in visible communion with the Holy See, he knows that he is in actual possession of this unity, because he is conjoined to what the whole world recognizes as historical Christianity. Even prescinding from other considerations, the prescription of twenty centuries guarantees that fact. Added to this, is the ever present experiential, objective miracle of Catholic unity, betokening, to all who wish to see it, that the finger of God is here.

On the other hand, if he finds that he is not in communion with the Holy See, then, at least, he will recognize that he is not conjoined to historical Christianity. In order to arrive at this realization, he has but to trace back to the origin of the sect with which he is presently affiliated. Then he will find that there was a definite point in time when the founders had withdrawn from communion with the Holy See, or from another sect which had, in turn, withdrawn from that communion. In other words, he will discover that *he is not a member* of the one Church of Christ.

As Applied to the Sect

The realization that one is not a member of the Church of Christ involves a study of certain painful facts. Insofar as the sect itself is concerned, it will be evident that its founders had received no Divine commission to bind and loose or to teach in the name of Christ. The Reformers violently attacked each other using this same argument: "By whom were you sent?" At the same time each was conveniently unaware that the same argument destroyed his own position. What was true then, is true now. They still possess no authority whatsoever; indeed, they claim none, whether taken separately or collectively in a world council. Yet the Scriptures attest that surely the one Church of Christ does possess such authority and the infallibility of the Divine promises guarantees that this Church will be a perpetual witness to His teachings before the world until the end of time. Historically and theologically this is verifiable in the Catholic and Roman Church alone. Not being members of this Church, they do not share in the promises made to it by Christ.

As Applied to the Individual

Insofar as the individual is concerned, the issue expresses itself in terms of eternal salvation. By the command, as also by the in-

stitution of Christ, there exists an intrinsic relationship between membership in this one Church and eternal salvation. Since the attainment of eternal life is absolutely out of proportion to human powers, taken by themselves, man needs the help of God. In this respect, then, it is God who declares the condition of salvation. Now, one of the essential conditions of salvation is relationship with the one Church of Christ. Therefore, no one is saved who is not actually a member of this Church or who is wanting in an effective will to become a member. This effective will to become a member of the Church can be explicit or implicit: explicit, when one takes steps towards membership; implicit, when one possesses the state of sanctifying grace conjoined with invincible ignorance of the true religion. In this latter instance, the person sincerely proposes to fulfil the whole will of God; God, who alone is the Judge of the individual conscience, will accept that sincere will for the actual deed. Even though He wills their actual membership in the Church, their possession of perfect charity, which goes with sanctifying grace, indicate that they will it implicitly. They are not members of the Church thereby, but they are linked to the Church, in virtue of which link they may be saved—but they are saved through the Church. However, this implicit bond may be broken once the invincible ignorance is removed and the person refuses to investigate further, having some definite intimation of his insecurity and the Divine authority of the Catholic Church.

Although God alone judges the individual, these principles are unassailable; they are recognized as valid in every other moral judgment that has to do with good faith and bad faith. Their pertinence is overwhelming when linked with the clear declarations of Holy Scripture. Accordingly, we would say that the point of departure in the reunion of Christendom is non-membership in the Church, looking towards membership as a goal, motivated by a desire for eternal salvation.

Third Question: How Shall We Move?

The third phase of the reunion of Christendom is to discover the way from the starting point to the goal. Since this is a movement from one point to another, it will involve a change of status, both internally and externally.

Internal Factors

Although the act of reunion is visible, and, if you will, juridical, taking place as it were in the public forum, still it is preceded and accompanied by internal factors. The internal factors are those intellectual and moral changes which are connoted by the word "conversion." Generally speaking, this conversion is the terminus of a process wherein Divine grace and human cooperation work together towards the relinquishing of one form and the acquisition of another. Briefly stated: Some external intimation is given to an individual person as to the insecurity of his present position or the truth of the Catholic Church to such an extent that he is moved to investigate the matter to satisfy himself on the point. Possibly, prejudice and education or moral dispositions may be so ingrained as to preclude examination. But, supposing this is overcome, progressive study and prayer will elicit a series of judgments. In the speculative order, after examining the Catholic Church and its teachings, he may arrive at a *judgment of credibility* i.e. it is accompanied with such clear evidence of Divine origin and power that he can see how a prudent person can believe it to be Divine. Then he passes into the practical order and further considerations lead to the *judgment of credentity* i.e. since all men must believe God, who is truth itself, when it is clear that He has spoken, and it is quite evident that He has spoken here, it must be obligatory upon anyone realizing this fact to believe it. Following upon this, the will, moved by Divine Grace, moves the intellect to make *the act of Faith*: I do believe this on God's authority. This process, more or less, is the pattern of conversion. For example, Francis J. Kinsman (formerly Episcopalian prelate of Delaware) reports as follows: "My opinions in regard to Roman Catholicism passed through four stages: it is not so bad after all; it is really quite good; it is the best thing I know; it is the Church. Only when the last was reached was there a genuine conversion."[8]

Throughout the whole process, especially in the later stages, Divine grace which enlightens the intellect and prompts the will is operating, although the man himself must cooperate with it. In almost every case there are obstacles which require generous sacrifices in the interest of the greater good, for example, family ties, position, friends, income, embarrassment of admitting error, pride etc. If, by reason of such considerations as these, the person fears to pursue his investigation, then he is answerable to God in proportion to

the light which he has been given; it is a matter between himself and his Creator.

So much for the internal factor. No one may be lawfully admitted to membership in the Catholic Church unless he assents to the whole body of revelation, proposed by the Church on the Authority of God and unless he is prepared to assume freely all the spiritual and moral obligations which go with actual membership in the Church.

External Factors

As regards the external factor of reunion, the act of reunion is one of reconciliation i.e. by reason of the sacramental-moral bond with the one Church of Christ: if baptized in infancy, he was an actual member, at least, until he reached the age of reason; if, as an adult, he was not made a member of the Church, but a subject by reason of the sacramental character. The juridical process is restoration of communion with the Church.

Problem of Corporate Reconciliation

As regards the question of corporate reconciliation, a distinction must be made between the quality of the agents and the form of return. Bodies constituted by private judgment, consisting of voluntary associations, are to be reconciled in terms of individual conversions, even though they may be received in small groups; they possess no status as distinct ecclesiastical units after being reconciled. Bodies retaining a validly consecrated hierarchy (though in schism) with a homogeneity of doctrine consonant with Catholic teaching (or, at least, are prepared to receive the whole Catholic Faith) may be reconciled in a formally corporate manner, dependent on their respective merits in the judgment of the Holy See; they may retain the ancient Catholic rites which they have preserved, together with such ecclesiastical customs as they had *before* the breach was made e.g. married clergy. The resultant issue to such reunion is membership in the Church.

Ultimate Resolution of the Question

The ultimate resolution of the reunion of Christendom reduces itself to individual responsibility. In cases where formal corporate

reunion is possible and feasible, but by reason of circumstances of time, place and person is presently impossible, the individual who is conscious of his status relative to the one Church of Christ is bound to seek his own personal reconciliation; the obligation is grave, under penalty of being guilty of the sin of formal schism. *A fortiori*, a member of an heretical sect, for which corporate reunion in a formal sense is impossible, and who, at the same time, fully aware of his status relative to the one Church of Christ, is bound under pain of falling into the same sin of formal schism, to seek his individual reconciliation. Cardinal Manning wrote to the Anglican unionists:

> It is not for us to ask, "Lord, what shall this man do?" The voice of Truth is articulate and clear, "Follow thou Me." To question about others is to forget ourselves. To check our own convictions is to resist a Divine grace. To wait for others is to assume a control over the dispensations of the Spirit. God calls whom, and as, and when He wills. We shall die alone, and be judged one by one. . . . It is not by "corporate" movements, nor by convictions merged in parties, that truth is served and souls saved. . . . The act of conforming our own intelligence to the truth, and our own will to obedience, is the highest, the most divine, the only way in which we can promote the unity of the Church and the supremacy of faith.[1]

Firmness and Charity

Finally, we can find no better way of concluding this dissertation, than by quoting from the Instruction of the Holy Office for December 20, 1949. It deals with the procedure of Catholic Ecumenists in seeking a reconciliation of dissidents with the Church. In the whole document, as in the other official documents, there is a sincere charity for all dissidents of Christian name, but, at the same time, an objective firmness in matters of faith and fact and a complete candor which manifests devotion to the truth and which, in the long run, will serve the best interests of all who seek the true reunion of Christendom. The whole document should be read in its entirety. We have attempted to compile this dissertation in the spirit of this document. Most noteworthy among its instructions we find:

> The whole and entire body of Catholic doctrine is, therefore, to be proposed and explained. Nothing embraced in the Catholic truth concerning the true nature and means of justification, the constitution of the Church, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction and the only real union effectuated by a return of dissidents to the one

true Church, must be passed over in silence or cloaked in ambiguous language. . . . All this must be truly set forth clearly and intelligibly for the double reason that they are really seeking the truth and that outside the truth no true union can ever be attained.[8]

NOTES

[1] *The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches; official report* (New York: Harper, 1949) p. 53.

[2] W.A. Visser't Hooft, *What is the World Council of Churches?* (New York: American Committee, 1939) p. 6.

[3] Francis Joseph Kinsman, *Salve Mater* (New York: Longmans, 1920) p. 292.

"It is my experience that the convert commonly passes through three stages or states of mind. The first is when he imagines himself to be entirely detached, or even to be entirely indifferent . . . it is that of a young philosopher who feels that he ought to be fair to the Church of Rome. . . . The second stage is that in which the convert begins to be conscious not only of the falsehood but the truth, and is enormously excited to find that there is far more of it than he would have ever expected. . . . And the third stage is perhaps the truest and most terrible. It is that in which the man is trying not to be converted. He has come too near the truth, and has forgotten that truth is a magnet, with the powers of attraction and repulsion. . . . It is impossible to be just to the Catholic Church. The moment men cease to shout it down they begin to listen to it with pleasure. The moment they try to be fair to it they begin to be fond of it. But when the affection has passed a certain point it begins to take on the tragic and menacing grandeur of a great love affair." G.K. Chesterton, *The Catholic Church and Conversion* (New York: Macmillan, 1929) p. 57-62.

[4] Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, p. 221-222.

[5] Holy Office, *Ecclesia Catholica*, AAS, XXXXII, 144; Eng. tr.: "The Ecumenical Movement" in: *Catholic Mind*, *op. cit.*, p. 381.

"We are ready to purchase the reunion of our separated brethren at any cost less than the sacrifice of a jot or tittle of the supernatural order of unity and faith. . . . We cannot barter or give that which is not our own. . . . We can offer unity only on the condition on which we hold it—unconditional submission to the living and perpetual voice of the Church of God. If this be refused, it is not we who hinder unity. For it is not we who impose this condition, but the Spirit of Truth who abides in the Church forever . . . Compromise, concession, conditions, transactions, explanations which soften the Divine decrees, and evade the precisions of infallible declarations of the Church, are not inspirations of the Holy Ghost. To hold out hopes of impossible events is deception and cruelty. . . . Clear, open, patient, loving exhortations, definite and precise declarations of truth without sharpness, and without controversy; holding up the light of faith, which by a sacramental power of its own enters into men and illumines them when they are least aware; confidence in the supernatural grace and the Divine mission of the Church, in its authority to teach and its power to save—these are our nets to let down into the sea, our sickles to reap in the Master's field." Henry Edward Manning, *England and Christendom*, *op. cit.*, 513, 219.